

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XVI.

APRIL, 1912.

No. 2.

WALTHER THE LUTHERAN.

(Continued.)

When Walther wrote the Preface to the third volume of *Der Lutheraner*, which we reproduced in our last article, events had occurred which can safely be set down as practical results of his testimony in behalf of genuine Lutheranism, and which foreshadowed Walther's activity as an organizer of the scattered forces of confessional Lutheranism in America.

And first, the immediate effect of Walther's outspoken defense of the original position of the Lutheran Church in doctrine and polity proved to be separating, disintegrating, disorganizing. Echoes of his testimony began to be heard in the councils of the Lutheran bodies operating at the time in the United States. There were mutterings of discontent on the part of men whose conscience had been touched by what they had read or heard of Walther's work. The confessional writings of the Church were being studied, present conditions and practices were being measured and tested by the standards of the Lutheran Church, and protests for conscience' sake were being raised against deviations from the Lutheran norm. Some of these documents deserve to be handed down to posterity, in order that our children who are growing away from the use of the language of their fathers may be enabled to recall at a later time what were the distressing conditions out of which the Missouri Synod ultimately arose, and what were the elements that contributed toward its growth and gave it the distinguishing marks that still characterize this Synod.

On January 24, 1846, Walther published the following article: "In No. 21 of *Lutherische Kirchenzeitung*, dated December 18th *ult.*, we find a document which eight Lutheran pastors and one teacher have addressed to the President of the General Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Ohio. In this document they state the reasons which have compelled them to sever their connection with the Synod aforesigned. They say: 'The *first* of these reasons is strictly of a churchly and confessional character, and rests on certain facts which have rendered it questionable to us whether the Synod is sincere and definite in its position and tendency as a church, and whether it takes a decided stand over and against the unionism of our times. These facts are as follows:

"'1) A year ago a conference in East Ohio had submitted to the Synod the question: Which synods are Lutheran? Synod deferred action on this question until the next year, but tabled the question at its last convention. In the mean time the spokesmen of the so-called Lutheran General Synod, which has but recently called itself the American Lutheran Church, are willfully treading the doctrine of our Church on the Sacraments under foot, and are setting up an anti-Lutheran practice, that of the Methodists, which is hostile to our Church.

"'2) Some of the undersigned had requested the Synod to remove the unionistic formula of distribution now in use among us at the celebration of the Lord's Supper, which formula begins: "Christ says," etc. Their petition was refused; on the contrary, it was recommended to the members of the Synod as being in accordance with their duty that in their official acts they use the Book of Forms introduced in 1842. This book is unchurchly and Calvinistic in all the formulas for absolution which it presents, and in its form for conferring ordination does not make the Confessions of the Lutheran Church binding upon the applicant.

"'3) An important petition had been addressed to the Synod by some of the undersigned. The petition asked,

“‘a) That the Synod officially accept all the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church;

“‘b) That the Synod raise a protest against the false teaching of the so-called Lutheran General Synod regarding the Sacrament;

“‘c) That the Synod thoroughly revise its method of examining candidates for the ministry;

“‘d) That the Synod, when admitting a candidate to ordination, make all the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church binding upon him;

“‘e) That the Synod do not permit its ministers to serve Reformed-Lutheran congregations, thus practically approving of the false unionism of our time.

“This petition was delayed and, because of insignificant technical errors of the committee reporting on the same, was recommitted. Finally, when the petitioners had withdrawn their petition, and had offered only this brief resolution: That the Synod henceforth accept all the confessional writings of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, and solemnly enjoin upon its candidates for ordination to consider themselves bound by the same,—action upon this matter, in a session of the Ministerium, was again postponed for three years. It was plain to us, from these transactions, that the Synod, in the majority of its members, possessed no sincere willingness to staunchly represent our Church in its battle with the false unionism of our times.

“As a *second* reason for their separation the undersigned offer the fact, that the Synod has, in a faithless manner and contrary to the demands of justice, deprived the Seminary at Columbus, which is the only Seminary among the four Lutheran Seminaries in our country that is *German* by its constitution, of its *German* character.”

“The document concludes as follows: ‘Inasmuch, then, as the Synod has decidedly violated the original constitution of the Seminary, and—this being, indeed, the main reason for

our separation — inasmuch as the Synod takes the crying need of our Church and the inroads which a false unionism is making upon it so little to heart that it refuses to grant even the justest petitions for meeting the most grievous needs of the Church; and inasmuch as the Synod has no ears and eyes for oral and written explanations of these petitions, and at this moment can hardly be regarded as acting in sheer ignorance; therefore we consider ourselves in duty bound to quit the synodical organization to which we have belonged hitherto. In conclusion, we beg to offer the urgent and cordial request that the Synod may not continue in its present state, and we implore the Synod for Christ's sake, for the sake of the souls which were dearly bought by Christ, for the sake of the pure and unadulterated Confessions of our Church, and for the sake of the heavy responsibility resting upon the Synod, no longer, from fear or favor of men, to shun and flee from the good fight and from offering its sincere testimony against the false unionism and syncretism of our times.

““FRIEDR. WINKLER, *Lutheran Pastor at Detroit,
Mich.*

““DR. W. SIHLER, *Lutheran Pastor at Fort Wayne.*

““A. SCHMIDT, *Pastor in Cleveland.*

““J. G. BUERGER, *Pastor in Hancock Co.*

““J. A. ERNST, *Pastor of the German Evangelical
Lutheran Congregation at Neudettelsau, Union
Co., O.*

““WILH. RICHMANN, *Lutheran Pastor in Bern Town-
ship, Fairfield Co., O.*

““ANDR. SAUPERT, *Lutheran Pastor in Evansville,
Vanderburg Co., Ind.*

““AUG. SELLE, *German Evangelical Pastor in Colum-
biana Co., O.*

““E. A. SCHUERMANN, *Teacher of the First German
Evangelical Lutheran Congregation at Pitts-
burgh.*

““Cleveland, O., September 18, 1845.”

“It is with profound grief that we report these transactions to our readers. They show us, alas! that in America, too, no denomination has suffered such a grievous decay as the society of those who call themselves ‘Lutheran.’ There is greater eagerness among all the sects of this country to preserve the false doctrines upon which they were founded, and which have given them their peculiar stamp, than there is determination among the so-called Lutherans of our country to keep the holy and pure doctrine, founded upon the clear Word of God, which by the ineffable grace of God has been committed to them. Aye, we behold the American Lutheran Church dominated, not only by carelessness and indifference, but even by hostility to the genuine Lutheran Church. The Lutheran Church of our country has retained nothing but the name; it has lost the old truth and the spirit of the old confessors.

“However, from the above report we also see that there is no reason why we should despair altogether of the subsistence of the Lutheran Church in America. It is manifest that God has taken His fan in hand to cleanse His threshing-floor, and to winnow His wheat. God is plainly resolved no longer to wink at the secret thieving of false saints and their fishing in troubled waters. God is beginning again, here and there, to open the eyes of some who view with horror the defection of which the Lutherans have become guilty. God is again raising up men here and there who call aloud, summoning their brethren to return to their first love which they have forsaken. God be praised! after a long winter the voice of the turtle is again heard in our land. (Song of Sol. 2, 11—13.) Up, up, then, my brethren! let us not sit by idly while false brethren are becoming more firmly united all the time for the purpose of undermining and removing the foundation of our Church. These false brethren, fighting treacherously as they do under our name, are more dangerous than our declared enemies: they are allied with our enemies, and yet dwell in our camp. True, He that sitteth in the heavens laughs, and the Lord hath them

in derision; for, ‘though the sea roar and be troubled, though the mountains shake with the swelling thereof. Selah. There is a river, the streams whereof shall make glad the city of God, the holy place of the tabernacles of the Most High. God is in the midst of her; she shall not be moved: God shall help her, and that right early.’ However, while it is impossible to force Luther’s doctrine, that is, the Word of God, out of the *world*, it is easily possible that *we* may lose our treasure (2 John 8. 9), and may be rejected as unfaithful stewards, if we do not hold fast the faithful Word (Tit. 1, 9—11), and earnestly contend for the faith (Jude 3). Therefore, let us, who do not make merely a hypocritical pretense of the Lutheran name, but mean to be and remain Lutherans in truth and deed,—let us close ranks, and rally again around the banner of the old, unalterable doctrine of our Church. Let us unite in prayer, asking God to arise for our help, that we may boldly teach His Word.¹⁾ Let us unite for the faithful confession of the truth. Let us unite for making war, with the sword of the Spirit, upon all falsifications of the truth. Let us unite for bearing the reproach with which the Lord is wont to distinguish His servants. Though we may not hope that by our united action the Church in these last grievous days will once more be brought to a flourishing and glorious condition, still we need not give up all hope that our testimony and our fighting will not be altogether in vain. We may be confident that we shall achieve praise for the Lord, and save many a soul from the error of its way.”²⁾

On August 8, 1846, Walther published the following communication:—

“In the southern part of Michigan there are several colonies which were founded for the greater part by emigrants who originally were Lutherans. These people were first served with the Word and the Sacraments by the Reverend Schmidt of Ann Arbor, who later trained a few young men for the

1) See Luther’s rendering of Ps. 12, 5.

2) *Der Lutheraner* 2, 42 f.

ministry and organized a so-called mission-synod with them. Their chief aim was directed toward establishing a mission among the Indians of Michigan, and they adopted the name 'German Lutheran Synod of Michigan.' Pastor Schmidt of Ann Arbor had also served the Lutheran congregation at Monroe. To the pastorate of this congregation Hattstaedt, a pupil of the Lutheran pastor Loehe in Franconian Bavaria, was called. Hattstaedt thus was brought into the membership of the Synod aforementioned. While he found in this Synod a great deal of ignorance as to what Lutheranism is, he found also that acceptance of all the confessional writings of the Lutheran Church of the pure confession was obligatory upon the members, and apparently there was the honest inclination to practice according to the Confessions. This induced Hattstaedt to call the attention of friends in the old country to this Synod and to its activity among the Indians in Michigan. As a result, the Franconians entered into a correspondence with the Michigan Synod, and, on receiving the definite statement that the Michigan Synod would carry on its mission on a strictly Lutheran basis, and would bind all its missionaries to adhere to all the confessional writings of our Church, the Franconians united with the Michigan Synod in a cooperative movement. The cooperation was begun in this way: The Lutheran candidates of the ministry Trautmann and Lochner were delegated to serve vacant German Lutheran congregations within the Synod of Michigan, and a small German Lutheran mission congregation, with its duly called pastor, A. Craemer, started from Franconia to aid in the mission to the Indians. Their plan was to locate somewhere on the Cass River, in the County of Saginaw, in the State of Michigan, and to carry on a mission among the Indians at Siboyer, jointly with the missionaries that had come from Ann Arbor. Besides, Franconian Lutherans sent large sums of money for the support of this mission. In the mean time, Rev. Dumser, an alumnus of the Basle Mission Institute, had arrived to serve the station at Siboyer. This gentleman had been ordained in the old

country, however, without having been bound to the Confessions of our Church. He declared later that he must regard an unreserved restriction to the Confessions of our Church as a violation of his conscience. In addition, the fact was revealed that at a former time the so-called Lutheran Synod of Michigan had openly served several union congregations *as such* with the Word and the Sacraments. Pastors Hattstaedt, Craemer, Trautmann, and Lochner at once united in a protest against these offensive practices. They insisted that the un-Lutheran missionary Dumser must be expelled, and that the Synod must vindicate itself from the charge of having served union congregations *as such*. However, at the convention of the Michigan Synod in June of this year, there was a miscarriage of the very first motion, to expel the un-Lutheran missionary Dumser, who persisted in his refusal to be bound to the Confessions of our Church without reservation. Accordingly, Pastors Hattstaedt, Craemer, Trautmann, and Lochner felt in conscience bound, not only to sever their connection with the Synod of Michigan and to protest against the action of the Synod in failing to vindicate itself, but also to deposit with the President of the Synod the reasons for their withdrawal in the exact form in which they are given below."

From the "Declaration of Withdrawal" which is appended at the end of the communication, we learn that the Franconian pastors had first offered their resolution to expel Dumser at a conference meeting called for that purpose, and that this conference had referred the entire matter to the Synod for action at its next convention. The Synod met on June 24th and the following days. The Franconian pastors renewed their protest against the membership of Dumser, but before the Synod took action on their protest, the Mission Board of the Synod had made a report, recommending that Dumser be confirmed in his office and sent to the post for which he had been intended.

The "Declaration" closes with these words:

"We part from the Synod with sincere grief because of the un-Lutheran position which the Synod maintains in spite

of the clear testimony which we have offered. We pray the Lord of the Church that He may soon lead the Synod of Michigan to see, and to be convinced, that its position is dangerous, especially amid the conditions prevailing among the churches of our country; and that it is necessary for our dear Church of the pure confession, and for the prosperous operation of Lutheran Synods, to be firm and decided in *doctrine* and *practice*.

“Ann Arbor, Washtenaw Co., Mich. On June 25, 1846, the anniversary of the presentation of the Augsburg Confession.

“W. HATTSTAEDT, *Pastor at Monroe, Mich.*

“A. CRAEMER, *Pastor of the Lutheran Mission congregation at Frankenmuth, Saginaw Co., Mich.*

“FR. LOCHNER, *Pastor at Toledo, O.*

“J. TRAUTMANN, *Pastor at Danbury, O.”³⁾*

While these events were taking place in the West, a voice of dissent and protest was also being raised in the East. Fr. Wyneken, after completing his famous missionary tours through Western Ohio, Northern Indiana, and Southern Michigan, had consented to become the pastor of the Second Lutheran Church at Baltimore. He thus came to affiliate with the Pennsylvania Synod and, through that, with the General Synod. The spirit of this man had been exhibited to the readers of *Der Lutheraner* in the first volume,⁴⁾ when Walther announced his stirring brochure which summoned aid from Germany to relieve the spiritual distress of the scattered Lutherans of America. Even at that early date, Wyneken had declared against the unionistic tendency dominant in the American Lutheran Church. What he saw in his own Synod, made him a still more determined opponent to the hybrid Lutheranism of his day. His testimony was offered in behalf of consistent Lutheran teaching and practice within his own Synod, and met with similar results as that of the brethren noted. He, too, was ultimately compelled to withdraw from

3) *Der Lutheraner* 2, 98 f.

4) p. 31.

a body that proved unwilling to adopt the true basis of our Church as a norm for its doctrine and polity. And the rebuffs with which Wyneken met in the East drew him into closer union with the stalwart defenders of genuine Lutheranism whom he beheld arising in the West.

In the communication describing the withdrawal of the Franconian pastors from the Synod of Michigan, the following remark occurs: "The brethren who have thus withdrawn will at once join the genuinely Lutheran Synod which is about to be organized at Fort Wayne, Ind."⁵⁾ Thus, the sad disintegration which we had to note above was not a mere splitting up of the forces of Lutheranism in a senseless and selfish striving for individual ideas and pretensions. The disintegrating parts began to coalesce, and out of all the disunion with which the synodical bodies in those days were threatened there was to grow a union on a strictly confessional basis.

(To be continued.)

ROMANISM A PLAGIARISM ON PAGANISM.¹⁾

(Concluded.)

AURICULAR CONFESSION.

In the pagan Mysteries certain priests, called Köes, heard the confession of the candidate for initiation, and put to him searching questions before purging the guilt away.

From Propertius, Tibullus, and Juvenal it appears that these questions were also very obscene.

The result of these Mysteries was great debauchery.

This paganism crept into Romanism, and from the pages of Peter Dens we learn what obscene questions were put by the confessor to the penitent, and from history we learn the disastrous results of auricular confession.

5) *Der Lutheraner* 2, 99.

1) The caption of the article in the last issue ("The Hierarchy") should be changed to the same as above.

On the complaint of a lady that her confessor had seduced her in the very church, Bishop Nectarius of Constantinople, about 390, forbade auricular confession. His successor, Chrysostom, says: "Neither do I constrain you to reveal your sins to men. Disclose your conscience before God. Lay open your wounds to Him and seek healing for them from Him."

In 1215, Innocent III made compulsory auricular confession a sacrament, to be done at least yearly, from seven years up.

Of this papal institution Cardinal Pallavicini says: "The throne of the priest is in the skies, and to him belongs it to administer the affairs of heaven. . . . Heaven receives from earth the power of judging. The Master must obey the servant and ratify above whatever the priest may decide here below." Again: "God Himself is bound to abide by the decisions of priests." (*The Catholic Priesthood*, with Card. M'Closky's approval.)

What is the result of this papal institution? Erasmus says a theologian of Louvain refused to absolve a priest who had confessed to guilt with over 200 nuns under his "spiritual direction." Pope Calixtus II, 1119—1122, speaks of woman "as a victim who found destruction where she sought salvation." Pope Alexander IV says in a bull: "The people, instead of being reformed, are corrupted by their pastors." In 1522, the Catholic princes of Germany at Nuernberg complained of the Confessional.

Pusey wrote that the Confessional "is the road by which a number of Christians go down to hell." (Tertullian, p. 315; in B. W-A., p. 197.)

PROCESSIONS.

Many heathen authors write of processions in honor of the gods and saints. Apuleius describes the "countless wax tapers and torches, seeming like stars fallen on the earth, the priests with tonsured heads carrying the relics of the omnipotent gods, . . . then one bearing the shrine wherein are inclosed

the holy mysteries, which include the sacred arcana of the magnificent religion."

Although Isaiah ridicules such processions and carrying of images, this paganism crept into the Roman Church. Gregory introduced them on a large scale in 590, when Rome suffered from a pestilence. When Cardinal Wiseman wished for such a penitential processsion, the *London Times* said: "The historic idea is simple enough, and as old as old can be. We have it in Homer — the procession of Hecuba and the ladies of Troy to the shrine of Minerva, in the Acropolis of that city."

The Lupercalia were celebrated on February 15 with processions and the most outrageous immoralities. Instead of these pagan processions Pope Gelasius I introduced the candlemas processions, each one bearing a candle as a symbol of the light of Christ, at the purification of Mary.

Pope Liberius set Christmas for the Saturnalia and the feast of Mithras; that is, at the winter solstice.

The old Robigalia were held on the 25th of April, going on the Via Flaminia to the Pons Milvius. The Litania Major was held on the same day and went the same way, beginning in S. Lorenzo in Lucina.

The Ambarvalia procession around the fields were held in May to get the blessing of Ceres for the crops. This pagan thing was kept up by papal Rome. In 511, the Council of Orleans made these yearly processions a rule throughout France.

Mid waving of banners and singing of hymns the statue of Isis was carried around. At certain stations the procession paused, and sacrifices were made. For the pagan Isis the papal "host" was substituted, and we have the Corpus Christi day procession.

Polydore Vergil writes: "The Romans and other nations made superstitious processions. From these, doubtless, is it that the custom among us is derived. For in the pomp of our processions it is usual to have some pleasantry go before, as files of soldiers, foot and horse, some figures also of ingenious construction for ridicule, such particularly as open a wide

gaping mouth and make a clattering noise with their teeth; these are mixed with other diversions. The prophets are personated; one acts David, another Solomon, others are habited as queens, artificial wings are tied to some children, and they are made to sing. . . . Calixtus, or, as some think, Urban, did begin the embering days quarterly for the protection of fruits ordained for the sustenance of men and beasts. Albeit, I rather take it to be imitation of the old Roman feasts which thrice in the year held saerifices for the prosperous increase of their corn: one, vinalia, for their wines; another, rubigalia, for all their grain, lest it should be mildewed; a third, floralia, for their fruits. . . . The use of dancing, as Livy saith, came from the Horuseans to Rome, which we execute much on holidays as they did, not without slander to our religion and damage of character. As for masks, they be so devilish that no honesty can be pretended to color them. Zacharias, Bishop of Rome, made a decree against them; but this availeth nothing."

THE UNBLOODY SACRIFICE.

In Jer. 7, 18 and 44, 19 the Lord condemns the making of cakes for the Queen of Heaven. These cakes were round to represent the disk of the sun; they were marked with a cross (*Tau*), and stamped with I. H. S. (Isis, Horus, Seb—the Mother, the Child, the Father of the gods).

This unbloody sacrifice spread from Assyria to the Paphians in Cyprus, and Tacitus tells us no blood was allowed to be offered on the altars of the Paphian Venus. In the fourth century, when the Queen of Heaven, under the name of the Virgin Mary, was beginning to be worshiped in the Christian Church, this "unbloody sacrifice" was also brought in. Epiphanius tells us the women of Arabia adopted this worship; they were treated as heretics, and branded with the name of Collyridians, from the Greek name for the cake they used, as they had been offered to Ceres in the Thesmophoria, the heathen feast of harvest.

In earliest heathen Rome neither images nor sacrifice of

animals were permitted, only cakes of fine wheaten flour (the *farre pium*), called "the unbloody sacrifice." At the end of the service the priest dismissed the congregation by loudly saying, "*Ite, missa est.*"

Just so later in papal Rome.

As in the worship of Isis the priest elevated the holy of holies for the adoration of the faithful, so in the mass the priest elevates the host for the adoration of the faithful.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

On the eve of a festival of a god in India images of mud from a sacred stream are brought to the houses, and priests recite texts inviting the god to the house and into the mud image. The eyes, nose, ears, mouth, hands, feet of the idol are touched in turn, by which, and by the recital of certain texts, a notable miracle is done: the image of mud is now supposed to be a living god. Only Brahmans may approach it, and their services are needed to present the gifts the family wish to offer.

As the Brahman turns a mud idol into a living god, so the Romish priest turns a piece of bread into God, makes God, and then sacrifices Him in the mass!

Liguori writes: "In this Sacrament He (Christ) is pleased to obey man himself. Yes, the King of Heaven descends from His throne in obedience to the voice of man, and remains upon our altars, according to His pleasure. . . . In this Sacrament He obeys as many creatures as there are priests upon earth."

The heathen taunted the early Christians that they had no sacrifices in their churches. They replied that they offered to God what was better than a sacrifice of material things—faith, love, obedience. Clearly, at that time there was no sacrifice of the mass, no transubstantiation.

About 831, Radbertus, a Benedictine of Corbie, taught transubstantiation. Ratramnus, another monk of the same place, refuted him; so did Berengar of Tours, who was protected by Pope Gregory VII, who would not permit Berengar to be called a heretic.

In 1215, Pope Innocent III, in the Fourth Lateran Council, decreed the dogma of transubstantiation as necessary to salvation.

“Was any man ever so mad as to take that which he feeds on for a God?” asks Cicero (*De Natura Deorum*, lib. III, c. 16). Not in pagan Rome, but in papal Rome. Either the popish priest makes God, and then sacrifices Him, or else all papists worship a bit of bread. Choose your horn of the dilemma!

Pope Julius I (336—352) says: “It is an ordinance of God and an apostolic behest that the bread and the wine should both be given separately to the laity.”

Pope Leo I (446) says: “Those who receive the body, but not the blood of Jesus Christ, shall be expelled from the community.”

Pope Gelasius (492) condemned “those who take the bread only, and not the wine, as persons who cherish superstition; either they shall receive both forms, or shall be refused both, because one and the same mystery cannot be divided.”

Pope Urban II (1094) says: “None shall be admitted to the altar unless they take both the bread and the wine.”

Pope Paschal II (1118) writes to Pontius, Bishop of Cluny, enforcing twofold acceptance, and exhorting that prelate “not to permit any departure to be made, through a novel and human institution, from that which Christ the Master ordained and did.”

The Council of Constance, 1414—1418, reversed the teaching of these infallible Popes, not to mention Christ and the apostles, by robbing the communicants of the cup.

AUTHORITY.

The Brahmins reserved the Vedas for their own use. This knowledge gave them such power that even the gods were obliged to do their bidding. If others desired a boon, they had to seek the help of the priests and pay a round sum for it.

Robbed of the Vedas, the low-caste people were given other books specially prepared for them and written with a purpose.

St. Chrysostom writes: "Let us not neglect the reading of Holy Scriptures, for that is a device of the devil which forbids us to behold the treasure lest we should thereby be enriched."

This "device of the devil" was introduced into popery.

As in Hinduism, so in Romanism. The Bible was taken from the people and reserved for the clergy, who were to explain it for the people. The creed of Pope Pius IV says it is Holy Mother Church's "business to judge of the true sense and interpretation of them," *i. e.*, the Scriptures. Mgr. Talbot wrote from the Vatican to Cardinal Manning: "What is the province of the laity? To hunt, to shoot, to entertain. These matters they understand; but to meddle with ecclesiastical matters they have no right at all."

When it was proposed to give the Bible to the conquered Moors in Arabic, Cardinal Ximenes, Prime Minister of Spain under Ferdinand and Isabella, said it was "casting pearl before swine," and he objected to give the Bible to Spaniards born in Christian homes: the Spanish language should be reserved for such writings as good men might write for the good of the common people.

For giving the Bible in English, Wiclif was called "the devil's instrument and the Church's enemy."

Quesnel said: "It is useful and necessary, at all times and in all places, and for all kinds of persons, to study the Scriptures, and to understand its spirit, its piety, and its mysteries."

Pope Clement XI, in 1713, solemnly condemned this truth.

SALVATION.

In India an interested priesthood has made the way of salvation difficult. Duties are multiplied, each in turn declared necessary. From the cradle to the grave, and beyond, every step must be taken under the guidance of a priest. And yet salvation is not assured.

As in heathenism, so in Romanism. From baptism to confirmation, to confession, to absolution, to marriage, to extreme unction, to burial, to purgatory, everything must be done under the direction and pay of the priest; and after all is done, and paid for, the good Catholic cannot be sure of his salvation. The Council of Trent says: "No man can know with infallible assurance of faith that he has obtained the grace of God."

But the Bible teaches a Christian to say joyfully: "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that He is able to keep that which I have committed unto Him against that day," 2 Tim. 1, 12. "There is now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus," Rom. 8, 1. 31—39.

In India, conduct is of two kinds—"necessary" and "meritorious." "Necessary" works must be done in order to escape punishment and hell; "meritorious" works are surplus good works, which may be used to pay off the debts made by sins.

By pilgrimages, gifts to the gods, presents to the Brahmins, acts of worship, building of temples, and similar good works, a man may more than balance his sins.

It is a common practice for a man to wound his body, swing on a lofty bamboo with an iron hook in his flesh, make a journey on foot a thousand miles to fetch a vessel of water from the sacred Ganges, and transfer this good work to any willing to pay for it.

In China a like system is in use. The virtue earned in a given year can be carried forward into the next year, and the debt of any year can be wiped out by extra good works in the following year. The surplus can be used for his welfare here and hereafter, or it can be given to others.

This heathen superstition was introduced by Romanism. Cardinal Bellarmine says: "Our good works do merit eternal life *condignly*, not only by reason of God's covenant and acceptance, but also by reason of the work itself." Vasquez says: "Seeing the works of good men do merit eternal life,

there is no need that any condign merit, such as that of Christ, should interpose, to the end that eternal life might be rendered to them."

The Council of Trent distinctly teaches that "Men are not justified by the imputation of Christ's righteousness alone." But that is just what the Bible teaches. "We conclude that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the Law," Rom. 3, 28; 4, 5; 2 Cor. 5, 19.

In 1350, Pope Clement VI teaches that the work of Christ, and the good works of the Virgin Mary, and the good works of all saints, form a huge fund, or treasury, in charge of the Pope, from which he can sell to any one as many good works as are needed.

Such forgiveness was sold by Tetzel, in 1517, and this scandal started Luther on the work of the Reformation.

In 1552, the Roman Catholic princes of Germany drew up a list of grievances against the Pope, and also complained that the people were encouraged to all sins by being able to buy forgiveness in this life and the next.

In Egypt, Emubis balances the good and the evil works of the dead, and so decides their fate; in Romanism the Archangel Michael has this duty.

As long as a man is uncertain of the result of the Judgment, he naturally fears to die. This drives him to seek the help of the priest in death, and to arrange for his further help after death. This gives Rome's priests such awful power over her people. In a famous letter of Pere le Chaise, confessor of Louis XIV of France, we see how the fear of St. Michael worked. "Many a time since (an atrocious crime of the King) when I have been at confession, I have shook hell about his ears, and made him sigh, fear, and tremble, before I would give him absolution. By this I saw he had still an inclination to me and was ere long to be under my government. So I set the baseness of the action before him by telling the whole story, and how wicked it was, and that he could not be forgiven till he had done some good action to balance that and expiate

the crime. Whereupon he at last asked me what he must do. I told him that he must root out all the heretics from his kingdom." And thus was brought about the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes—and the massacre of the Huguenots, the French Protestants.

When the old Roman Pontifex Maximus, Emperor Vespasian, needed the money, he sold pardons to criminals; when the new Roman Pontifex Maximus, Pope Leo X, needed the money, he sold pardons to criminals. "We, Leo, have granted John Tetzel the most ample power of communicating indulgences, so that he can absolve in all cases, specially and generally, and in any manner soever, reserved to the Roman Apostolice See, such as the same see would be rightly consulted upon: also of absolving from sins repented of, confessed, and forgotten, and even of those not repented of, and not confessed; and, in the moment of death, of bestowing a universal remission of all sins, guilt, and penalty, to be paid in purgatory: also to shut the gates of hell, and to open the gate of Paradise."

"Let indulgences and all other heathenism be abolished."
(*A Modernist's Letters to Pius X*, p. 188.)

PERSECUTIONS.

Heathen Rome put down the Bacchanalian worship about 200 B. C.; later it made war on the worship of Isis; human sacrifices were forbidden in Africa; Claudius tried to root out Druidism in Gaul. For about three hundred years the heathen could always say to the Christian, "You have no right to live." The sword of Damocles hung over every Christian's neck, and it often came down in bloody persecutions.

With the Emperor Constantine the persecution of the heathen began about 325: it was continued by his successors, by Charles the Great, Olaf Tryggvason, and others.

When James and John would call fire from heaven upon some who rejected Christ's words, the Savior was horrified and rebuked them. "Ye know not what manner of spirit ye are of. For the Son of Man is not come to destroy men's lives, but to

save them," Luke 9, 54—56. When Peter took the sword to defend Christ, the Savior sternly commanded, "Put up again thy sword into his place!" Matt. 26, 50—54.

In the spirit of Christ Tertullian said: "It is not the part of religion to force religion, which must be accepted willingly, not by force." And Lactantius said: "Nothing is so voluntary as religion." And the schismatic leader Donatus remonstrated: "What has the emperor to do with the Church?"

And yet, when the Popes became temporal rulers, they continued the work of persecution. Their rule was very unpopular. There were 161 rebellions of papal subjects between 896 and 1859, an average of sixteen in every century, says Marion Crawford in *Ave Roma Immortalis* (Vol. II, p. 73).

Think of the Waldenses and Albigenses, the Spanish inquisition, the papal inquisition, the Massacre of St. Bartholomew, the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, the expulsion of the Salzburgers!

The inquisition punished in Spain alone 258,782 people; in the Netherlands 100,000 were killed according to Hugo Grotius, 500,000 according to the Prince of Orange.

Montanus, Secretary of the Holy Office for some years, writes, in 1560, that the familiars of the inquisition "were bawds, thieves, shifters, and the vilest sort of people, that live by filching, that cannot or will not hold their hands if they should hang for it. Such friends accused honest men and pure women of heresy, and then tortured the men and violated the women."

"*Roma semper eadem*," Rome is always the same, she never changes. Had Rome the power to-day, Rome would persecute. This is not an inference and a charge of Protestantism, it is the admission, nay, the proud boast of Rome, expressed even by her infallible Pope. Pope Pius IX, in his notorious *Syllabus* of December, 1864, calls it a grievous error to suppose that "the Church has not the right to use force, . . . that the ecclesiastical authority ought not to exercise this prerogative

without the permission and assent of the civil government.” (Sec. V, §§ 24, 20.)

Joachim dei Segni, while Archbishop of Imola, approved cordially this *Syllabus*, and when he was Pope Leo XIII, he in many encyclicals lamented that he could not use force, that is, persecute, that is, set up the inquisition.

Ovid describes Janus as follows: “He, holding in his right hand a staff and in his left a key, uttered these accents to me from the mouth of his front face: . . . ‘Whatever thou beholdest around thee, the sky, the sea, the air, the earth, all these have been shut up, and are opened by my hand. In my power alone is the guardianship of the vast universe, and the prerogative of turning the hinge is entirely my own. . . . I preside over the portals of heaven: through my agency Jupiter himself doth pass and repass.’” (*Fasti*, Bk. I.)

Since the earliest times the Pontifex Maximus in Rome was the chief official, the judge and arbiter of things divine and human, to whom the king and, later, the consuls were subordinate.

The heiress, administratrix, and advocate of this view of political law was the city of Rome with her Pontifex Maximus, and it stands to reason that she employed these principles to her own advantage. (Chamberlain, *Foundations*, II, pp. 8, 9.)

Renan writes: “If at the present day we wished to recover a living image of paganism, we should have to look for it in some village lying forgotten in the depths of a [Catholic] country district altogether behind the times.” (*Infl. of Rome on Christianity*, p. 32.)

Harnack, in July, 1889, called Roman Catholicism “a new form of paganism.”

Gibbon writes: “If, in the beginning of the fifth century, Tertullian or Lactantius had been suddenly raised from the dead to assist at the festival of some popular saint or martyr, they would have gazed with astonishment and indignation on the profane spectacle which had succeeded to the pure and spiritual worship of a Christian congregation. As soon as the

doors of the church were thrown open, they must have been offended by the smoke of incense, the perfume of flowers, and the glare of lamps and tapers, which diffused at noonday a gaudy, superfluous, and, in their opinion, sacrilegious light." (Chap. 28.) Again: "It must ingenuously be confessed that the ministers of the Catholic Church imitated the profane model they were so impatient to destroy." Gieseler writes: "Pagan dresses for the priests, pagan festivals for the people, pagan doctrines and ideas of all sorts, are everywhere in vogue." (II, pp. 40, 45.)

Jovinian, and all who resisted the pagan ideas and pagan practices, were excommunicated and persecuted. (Gibbon V, p. 176.)

P. T. Forsyth of Cambridge writes that Luther's reformation "was a war with paganism, but it was the more terrible Christian paganism." (p. 19.) Luther's reformation "saved the Church from a pagan corruption." (*Rome, Reform, and Reaction*, p. 82.)

"The system . . . goes back to a secular origin in the pagan imperial system of ancient Rome." (Hobhouse, *Bampton Lectures*, 1909, p. 212.)

Hobbes says, "If a man considers the origin of this great ecclesiastical Dominion, he will easily perceive that the papacy is no other than the ghost of the deceased Roman Empire, sitting crowned upon the grave thereof."

Ruskin, in his "Stones of Venice," says: "The papacy is entirely heathen in all its principles."

Dean Merivale, in his "Four Lectures on Some Epochs of Early Church History," says: "The real corruption of the age was shown in the unstinted adoption of pagan usages in the ceremonial of the Christian Church. . . . The whole essence of paganism was percolating the ritual of the Church and the hearts of the Christian multitude. The fasts prescribed by the Church had their parallel in the abstinence imposed by certain pagan creeds: the monarchism they extolled so warmly was in its origin a purely pagan institution; the canonizing of saints

and martyrs, the honors paid them, and the trust reposed in them, were simply a revival of the old pagan mythologies; the multiplication of formal ceremonies, with processions, and lights, and incense, and vestments, with images, and pictures, and votive offerings, was a mere pagan appeal to the senses; the general aspect of Christian devotion was a faint and rather frivolous imitation of the old pagan ritual."

The Rev. E. Edwin Hall, chaplain of the American Legation at Rome and of the American Church at Florence, made a careful study of the early history and of the modern characteristics of Roman Catholicism, and in July, 1889, wrote in the quarterly *Sabbath Outlook*: "Soon after the so-called conversion of Constantine, the Church entered on its apostasy from the primitive simplicity and purity which marked its earlier history. Pagans in vast multitudes pressed into the Christian fold, bringing with them old practices and customs, and filling the places of Christian worship with the pageantry and the ornaments which characterized the worship of the gods in heathen temples. These unconverted millions became only nominally Christian, impressing their character, together with the doctrines, rites, and forms of pagan religion, upon the Christian Church."

Sir George Sinclair, in his "Letters to the Protestants of Scotland" (First Series, p. 121) says: "Romanism is a refined system of Christianized heathenism, and chiefly differs from its prototype in being *more* treacherous, *more* cruel, *more* dangerous, *more* intolerant."

Dr. James D. Eaton, of the American Board, said in New York City: "The prevailing religion [in Mexico] is Roman Catholic, but it is so largely debased by admixtures of heathenism that it was pronounced by a French chaplain, in the time of Maximilian, to be a 'baptized paganism.'" (*Converted Catholic*, June, 1911, p. 209.)

Beda Venerabilis, in Book I, chap. 30, writes: "From that time the worship of the Roman Catholic Church, in its forms and ceremonies, has been more clearly identified with

the paganism of ancient Rome than with the religion of the New Testament. The customs of pagan religion were only baptized with Christian names. Gregory the Great, in the latter part of the sixth century, ignoring the sovereignty of the Holy Spirit and the power of the Gospel, directed the Monk Augustine, whom he sent to convert the idolaters of England, ‘not to suspend or abolish the pagan festivals nor the customs of their worship, but rather retain them, contenting himself with substituting for the names of false gods the names of saints borne by their temples, and whose reliques were deposited in them.’”

Fauchet says: “The bishops of this kingdom employ all means to gain men to Christ, converting to their use some pagan ceremonies.”

Pierre Moussard quotes William de Choul, counselor to the king: “Many institutions in our religion have been borrowed and transformed from Egyptian and pagan ceremonies, such as tunics and surplices, priestly ornaments for the head, bowing at the altar, the solemnity at mass, etc.”

Baronius says: “It was permitted the Church to transfer to pious uses those ceremonies which the pagans had wickedly applied in a superstitious worship. . . . Thus the pagan festivals, laden with superstition, were changed into the praiseworthy festivals of the martyrs.”

Polydore Vergil says: “The Church has borrowed many customs from the religion of the Romans and other pagans.”

Aringhus, in his “Subterraneous Rome,” acknowledges this conformity between the pagan and popish rites, and defends the admission of the ceremonies of heathenism into the service of the Church, by the authority of their wisest popes and governors, who found it necessary, he says, in the conversion of the Gentiles, to dissemble and wink at many things, and yield to the times.”

Cardinal Wiseman, in the second of his “Letters to John Poynder, Esq., upon his work entitled, ‘Popery in Alliance with Heathenism’” (London, 1836), grants the facts and concedes

the parallels, and even adds many more items of resemblance, and says the Emperor Julian made the same charge, as did Faustus the Manichee, and then defends the policy of conforming Christianity to the popular paganism to secure conversions.

Cardinal Newman admits in regard to "holy water" and many other things that were, as he says, "the very instruments and appendages of demon-worship," — that they were all of pagan origin, and "sanctified by adoption into the Church." (*Development*, pp. 359, 360, in Hislop, p. 200.)

Walter Rauschenbusch says: "The ascetic ideal was originally due to non-Christian influences." (*Christianity and the Social Crisis*, p. 167.)

"All the old essentials of pagan religion were reproduced in Christian form, but with scarcely a break in their essence: the effort to placate God by sacrifice, the amulets, cows, oracles, festivals, incense, candles, pictures, and statues. It was like a tropical jungle sprouting again after it is cut down." (p. 177.)

THE STATIONS.

The papal Roman "stations" of the Passion were copied from the pagan Roman army usage. (O. B. Frothingham, p. 178.)

FRIDAY FISH.

Those who consider it pious or proper to eat fish on Venus' day, or Friday, proclaim themselves, unconsciously, adherents of those heathen ideas which deified parts about which no one now likes to talk. (Inman's *Ancient Pagan and Modern Christian Symbolism*, p. 1. New York, 1884, J. W. Bouton.)

THE TIARA.

The papal tiara has not about it anything particularly Christian, a similar head-dress having been worn by gods or angels in ancient Assyria, where it appeared crowned by an emblem of "the trinity." All mention, in passing, that as the Romanists adopted the miter and the tiara from "the

cursed brood of Ham," so they adopted the episcopalian crook from the augurs of Etruria, and the artistic form with which they clothe their angels from the painters and urn-makers of Magna Graecia and Central Italy. (l. c., p. 64.)

THE PALLIUM.

The modern pallium worn by the Roman priest is the ancient sistrum of Isis or yoni of the Hindoos, symbolic of the celestial virgin. (l. c., p. 103.)

On head, shoulders, breast, and body we may see on Christian priests the relics of the worship of Venus and the adoration of woman! (l. c., p. 104.)

THE SACRED HEART.

Horus of Egypt, Vishnu of India, Bel of Babylon, were represented as carrying the sacred heart outside on the breast. Papal Rome does the same to-day with the "sacred heart" of Jesus. (Doane.)

THE AGNUS DEI.

The ancient pagans wore charms to drive away disease. Chrysostom complains that Antioch people bound brass coins of Alexander the Great about their heads to keep off or drive off disease.

The pagan Roman children carried around their necks a small ornament in the form of a heart, called *Bulla*. — The papal Roman children do the same. Cardinal Baronius says that those who have been baptized carry pendent from their necks an *Agnus Dei*, in imitation of a devotion of the pagans. (Doane, p. 405.)

FESTIVALS.

Gregory of Nyssa praised Gregory Thaumaturgus, Bishop of New Caesarea in Pontus, in 243, for changing the pagan festivals into Christian holidays, the better to draw the heathen to the religion of Christ: (Doane, p. 413.)

Dr. Draper, of the New York University, writes: "Crowds of worldly persons who cared nothing about its religious ideas, became its warmest supporters. Pagans at heart, their in-

fluence was soon manifested in the paganization of Christianity that forthwith ensued (under Constantine).

“The reign of Constantine marks the epoch of the transformation of Christianity from a religion into a political system. Paganism was modified by Christianity, Christianity by paganism.

Great is the difference between Christianity under Severus (born 146) and Christianity under Constantine (born 274). Many of the doctrines which at the latter period were preeminent, in the former were unknown. In accomplishing this amalgamation, Helen, the empress-mother, aided by the court ladies, led the way. As years passed on, the faith described by Tertullian (150—195) was transformed into one more fashionable and more debased. It was incorporated with the old Greek mythology. Olympus was restored, but the divinities passed under new names. Heathen rites were adopted. The festival of the Purification of Mary was invented to remove the uneasiness of heathen converts on account of the loss of their Lupercalia, or feasts of Pan. The apotheosis of the old Roman times was replaced by canonization; tutelary saints succeeded to local mythological divinities. Then came the mystery of transubstantiation, or the conversion of bread and wine by the priest into the flesh and blood of Christ. As centuries passed, the paganization became more and more complete.

The pagan Roman augur's chief ensign was the *lituus*; the papal Roman bishop's chief ensign is the same *lituus*, now called *crozier*.

At weddings it was the custom to sing hymns to Venus. (*Religion and Science*, pp. 30—49.)

O. B. Frothingham says: The papal Moses wears the horns of the pagan Jove. The papal Peter bears the keys of the pagan Janus. The statues of Jupiter, Apollo, Mercury, Orpheus did duty for the Christ. Ceres, Cybele, Demeter, assume new names as “Queen of Heaven,” “Star of the Sea,” “Maria Illuminatrix.” Pluto and Proserpina resign their

seats in the hall of final judgment to the Christ and His mother. The *aura placida* of the poets, the gentle breeze, is personified as Aura and Placida. The *perpetua felicitas* is personified as St. Perpetua and St. Felicitas, guardian angels of the pious soul. Alb and chasuble recalled the fashions of Numa's day. The cast-off purple habits and shoes of pagan emperors beautified the august persons of Christian popes. The cardinals must be content with the robes once worn by senators. The pope thrust out his foot to be kissed, as Caligula, Heliogabalus, and Julius Caesar had thrust out theirs.

No relic of paganism was permitted to remain in its casket. A complete investigation of this subject will probably reveal the fact that Christianity [of course, the author means Roman Catholicism] owes its entire wardrobe, ecclesiastical, symbolical, dogmatical, to the religions that preceded it. (*Cradle of Christ*, pp. 178—181.)

Père Premere, a Jesuit missionary to China, was driven to conclude that the devil had practiced a trick on the Jesuits, so close was the resemblance of the Buddhist to his own religion. (Doane, p. 401.)

It is remarkable that a Christian church should have adopted so many pagan symbols as Rome has done. (Inman, p. 102.)

Renan writes: "Almost all our superstitions are the remains of a religion anterior to Christianity, and which Christianity has not been able entirely to root out." (*Hibbert Lectures*, p. 32.)

Much of the religion of the lower orders, which we regard as essentially *Christian*, is ancient *heathenism* refitted with Christian symbols. (Baring-Gould's *Curious Myths*, p. 426; in Doane, p. 397.)

Dr. Conyer Middleton writes: "In St. Agnes they showed me an antique statue of a young Bacchus, which, with a new name and some little change of drapery, stands now worshiped under the title of a female saint." (*Letters from Rome*, p. 84; in Doane, p. 398.)

Turretin says: "It was not so much the empire that was brought over to the faith as the faith that was brought over to the empire; not the pagans who were converted to Christianity, but Christianity that was converted to paganism." (Doane, p. 410.)

The object of the Reformation was to remove from Christianity the pagan ideas and pagan rites engrafted upon it by Constantine and his successors, in their attempt to reconcile the Roman empire to it. The Protestants designed to bring it back to its primitive purity; and hence, while restoring the ancient doctrines, they cast out of it all such practices as the adoration of the Virgin Mary and the invocation of the saints. (Dr. Draper, p. 298.)

Milwaukee, Wis.

W. DALLMANN.

For the benefit of those who would make a personal study of the subjects which Rev. Dallmann has discussed for some time in these pages, we append a bibliography which he has furnished:—

Lord Acton's *Quirinus*, Letters from Rome, 1870. — *lect. Mod. History*, 1906; *Histor. Essays*, 1907; *History of Freedom*, 1907; Letters; *Lord Acton and His Circle*. — *Anglican Brief*. London: Simpkin, 1893. — Wm. Arthur, *Pope, Kings, and People*. London. — Jno. A. Bain, *Devel. of R. C.*; *The New Reformation*. — Bezold, *Geach. d. Reformation*. — Arthur Boethlingk, *Goethe u. d. kirchl. Rom*, 1902; *Schiller u. d. kirchl. Rom*, 1905. — W. E. Beet, *Rise of Papacy*. London, 1910. — Chas. Bigg, *The Church's Task under the Roman Empire*. Oxford, 1905. — Blatchford, *Church Councils and Their Decrees*. Boston, 1909. — Bright. — Brinkman's *Notes on Papal Claims*. — Britannica. — Bryce, *Holy Roman Empire*. — Jacob Burckhardt, *Civil. of Renaissance in Italy*. 2 vols. — W. R. Carson, *Reunion Essays*, 1903. — *Catholic Encyclopedia*. — H. S. Chamberlain, *Grundzüge des XIV. Jahrh.*; the English translation. — J. F. Clarke, *Events and Epochs in Rel. Hist.* — E. T. Colman, *The Pope*. Philadelphia, 1878. — Bishop Gore, *Vat. Council*. Lippincott's, 1870. — Coquerel, *First West. Transformations of Christianity*. — Doellinger, *Janus*. — Dearden, *Mod. Romanism Examined*, 3d ed.; London, 1909. — *Deutsche Reichstagssitzungen unter Kaiser Karl V.* Bd. 3. — T. W. Doane, *Bible Myths*. New York. — J. W. Draper, *Religion and Science*. — Flick, *Rise of the Mediaeval Church*. Putnam's, 1909. — Forsyth, *Rome, Reform, and Reaction*. — O. B. Frothingham, *Cradle of Christ*. Putnam's, 1877. — Fradryssen, *R. C. Capitulating before Prot.* Mobile, 1908. — Froude, *Lect. on Trent*; *Lect. on Erasmus*. Galton. *Our Attitude towards Engl. Rom. Catholics*. 2d ed.; London, 1902. — Gieseler, *Church History*. Gladstone, *Rome*. Tauchnitz, 1875. — Bishop Gore, *R. C. Claims*, 9th ed., 1905. — Bishop Grafton, *Christian and Catholic*; *Pro-Romanism*; *A Correspondence*; *A Rejoinder*. — Gregorovius, *Rome in Mod. Ages*. — Gruppe, *Griseh. Mythologie*, pp. 1651—1657. — Gwatkin, *Early Church History*, 1909. — *Handbuch d. deut. Geschichte*. Bd. II, 2. Aufl. — Harnack, *Expansion of Christianity*, vol. 2, 1905. — Hase, *Handbook Controv. Rome*. R. T. S. 1906. — Hatch, *Infl. Greek Ideas*. Hibbert Lectures.

— Hauck, *Der Gedanke d. paebstlichen Weltherrschaft bis auf Bonifaz VIII.* Leipzig, 1904; *Deutschland u. d. paebstliche Weltherrschaft.* 1910. — Hislop, *The Two Babylons.* 3d ed. — Hittel, *Papacy.* — Heyck, *Luther.* — Hobhouse, *Bampton Lect.* 1909. — Hoensbroech, *Papsttum.* 2 vols.; Leipzig, 1906; *Rom u. d. Zentrum.* Leipzig, 1907; *Der Syllabus.* Muenchen, 1904; *Mod. Staat u. Roem. Kirche.* Berlin, 1906; *Zweck heiligt die Mittel.* Berlin, 1904. — *Ideas that have Influenced Civilization.* 10 vols. Milwaukee. — Inman, *Ancient Pagan and Modern Christian Symbolism.* New York, 1884. Isaacson, *Our Brief Against Rome.* R. T. S. 1905. — Joh. Janssen, *Geschichte.* — Kitts, *In the Days of the Councils; Pope John XXIII.* — Gust. Krueger, *The Papacy.* 1909. — Lea, *Hist. Celibacy.* 2d ed.; Boston, 1884; *Hist. Inquisition.* 3 vols.; New York, 1888; *Hist. Inquisition in Spain.* 4 vols. New York, 1906; *Formulary Papal Penitentiary in XIII. Century.* Philadelphia, 1892. — *Leo XIII's Encyclical Letters.* Benzinger Bros., New York, 1903. — *Letters to His Holiness Pope Pius X by a Modernist.* Chicago, 1910. — A. H. Lewis, *Paganism Surviving in Christianity.* Putnam's, 1892. — Littledale, *Petrine Claims.* 1889; *Plain Reasons.* 1905. — T. Livius, *St. Peter, Bishop of Rome.* London, 1888. — W. Lockett, *Judge Fairly.* London, 1910. — Gerh. Loeschcke, *Jued. u. Heidn. im christl. Kult.* Bonn, 1910. — Loomis, *Great Conflict.* New York, 1874. — Macaulay, *History; Essays.* — McCabe, *Decay of Church of Rome.* — McCarthy, *Rome in Ireland.* London, 1904; *Five Years in Ireland.* Dublin; *Priest and People in Ireland.* Dublin, 1903. — M'Clintock and Strong, *Hauck R. E.* — Bishop McIlvaine, *Righteousness by Faith.* 3d ed. Philadelphia, 1868. — McKim, *Leo XIII at Bar of History.* Washington, D. C., 1897. — E. Garnet Man, *Papal Aims and Papal Claims.* Swan Sonnenschein. — H. K. Mann, *Lives Popes Early Middle Ages.* London, 1910. — Carl Mirbt, *Quellen z. Gesch. d. Papstt.* — Neander, *Church History.* — Frederick Nielsen, *Hist. Papacy XIX. Century.* 2 vols.; London, 1906. — Fr. Nietzsche, *Der Antichrist.* — Nippold. — F. H. O'Donnell, *Paraguay on Shannon.* Dublin, 1908. — Oxenham, *Validity of Papal Claims.* — W. Preston, *Romanism Weighed.* London. — *Prot. Dictionary.* — *Protestants' Treasury.* London, 1910. — H. C. Pedder, *Shadow of Rome.* London, 1905. — Hans Preuss, *Der Antichrist.* Leipzig, 1906. — F. W. Puller, *Primitive Saints and See of Rome.* — Rainy, *Ancient Cath. Church.* — Emil Reich, *Select Documents.* London, 1905. — Reinkens, *Paepstliche Decrete.* — Renan, *Inst. Rome on Christianity.* Hibbert Lect., 1880. — J. H. Robinson, *Study Luth. Revolt.* Am. Hist. Review, Jan., 1903. — Alex. Robertson, *R. C. Church in Italy.* 5th ed.; London, 1905. — Ed. Rabaud, *Altheidnische Wurzeln im kath. Kultus.* 2. Aufl., 1906; Bertelsmann. — Em. Rhoidis, *Pope Joan.* London, 1886. — Chas. Reade, *Cloister and Hearth.* — Canon Robertson, *Growth of the Papal Power.* S. P. C. K. — Salmon, *Infallibility of the Church.* 1899. — Schaff, *Church History.* — Schiek, *Prot. Antwort Pius IX.* Erlangen, 1869; Deichert. — Philip Sidney, *Modern Rome in Modern England.* R. T. S., 1906. — Simpson, *R. C. Opposition to Papal Infallibility.* 1909. — Stearns, *Faith of Our Forefathers.* 9th ed., New York. — I. Taylor, *Ancient Christianity.* — Cardinal Merry del Val, *Truth of Papal Claims.* — Vaughan, *Medici Popes.* 1908. — Jos. S. Van Dyke, *Popery.* Philadelphia, 1871. — R. E. Welsh, *People and Priest.* 3d ed.; London, 1902. — Wetzer und Welte, *Kirchenlexikon.* — B. Willard Archer, *Characteristics of the Roman Church.* London. — K. Wieland, *Deutsche Abrechnung mit Rom.* 1911. — Wilkins, *Paganism in Papal Church.* 1901. Swan Sonnenschein. — Wissowa, *Rel. u. Kultur d. Roemer.* — A. D. White, *Seven Great Statesmen.* 1910. — Adolf Wrede, *Die Beschwerden d. deut. Nation.* Nuernberg, Febr., 1523. — J. A. Wylie, *The Papacy.* London, 1876. — *Words of Help.* Am. Tract Soc. — Baroness von Zedwitz, *Double Doctrine of Rome.* Revell.

THE PROOF TEXTS OF THE CATECHISM WITH A PRACTICAL COMMENTARY.

THE SECOND ARTICLE.

(Continued.)

CHRIST'S SITTING AT THE RIGHT HAND OF GOD.

Ps. 110, 1: *The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit Thou at my right hand, until I make Thine enemies Thy footstool.*

The *right hand* of God, what is it? God is a spirit, hence has neither a right hand nor a left hand. The expression is an anthropomorphism. What does it signify? To the people of Israel, Moses said: "And thou shalt remember that thou wast a servant in the land of Egypt, and Jehovah, thy God, brought thee out thence by a *mighty hand* and by an *out-stretched arm*," Deut. 5, 15. Clearly God's *hand* and *arm* here indicate His great *power*. "Thou hast a mighty arm," says the Psalmist; "*strong* is Thy *hand*, and *high* is Thy *right hand*," Ps. 89, 13. Obviously again, *hand*, *right hand*, bespeaks God's almighty power. Hence in the trial before the Sanhedrin, Jesus, speaking of His exaltation, says: "Henceforth ye shall see the Son of Man sitting at the *right hand of power*."

As the expression "*right hand of God*" is figurative, so is the phrase: "*sitting* at the *right hand of God*." What does it mean? The mother of the sons of Zebedee asks Jesus: "Command that these my two sons may sit one on Thy *right hand* and one on Thy *left hand*, in Thy kingdom," Matt. 20, 21. Jesus understands this request as meaning that the sons should be allowed to *share in the rule* of His kingdom; cf. v. 25. The locution: to sit at the *right hand* of a ruler, therefore, conveys the idea of *participating in the rule*.

Now as to our text. Ps. 110 is a Messianic psalm. This we have on no less an authority than Christ's Himself. One day, when the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus propounded the question, "What think ye of Christ? Whose Son is He?" They answered, "The *Son of David*." Then

followed the perplexing question, "How, then, doth David in Spirit call Him *Lord*, saying, The Lord said unto my Lord," etc., Matt. 22, 41 ff. David's Lord is none other than Christ. Christ, the Messiah, is true God and true man in one person. This the blind Pharisees could not see. Cf. also Mark 12, 35 ff.; Luke 20, 41 ff.; 1 Cor. 15, 25; Hebr. 1, 13.

David begins his comforting psalm thus: "*The Lord* (the Father) *said unto my Lord* (Christ)." Two persons are here discriminated: the speaker and the one spoken to; but both are called "Lord." The Father is Lord; Christ is Lord. Christ is equal with the Father; Christ is God. But David's Lord is also David's son, true man. As the God-man He had been sent forth to redeem them that were under the Law. Even in this state of humiliation David's son was "God over all," Rom. 9, 5, "the Mighty God," Is. 9, 6, "our great God," Tit. 2, 13. But in that state the Messiah did not constantly use the divine majesty communicated to His human nature. David "in Spirit," *i. e.*, by divine inspiration, sees the work of redemption completed, sees the state of humiliation of his son come to an end. Now the Father says to David's son: "*Sit Thou at my right hand*," *i. e.*, share in my rule; rule with me with divine power and majesty. God exalted the man Christ. According to Christ's divine nature, He could not be exalted; in reference to it the Father could not and would not say: "*Sit at my right hand*." The very word "sit" indicates that these words were said to Him according to His human nature. Now, in the state of exaltation, Christ, *also according to His human nature*, rules all things with divine power and majesty. That is the significance of His *sessio ad dexteram*. Hence we read in v. 2: "Rule Thou (Christ) in the midst of Thine enemies," which enemies are made His "footstool," v. 1.

Eph. 1, 20—23: *God set Him (Christ) at His own right hand in the heavenly places, far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come: and hath put all things under His feet, and gave Him*

to be the Head over all things to the Church, which is His body, the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.

The paragraph, Eph. 1, 15—23, of which the foregoing text forms the close, contains a supplication of St. Paul for the Christians at Ephesus. It is replete with consolation and encouragement for the Christians and the Christian Church. Our text speaks of the Church, of its security. We often tremble for its welfare. We observe the high winds and the angry waves of adversity coming threateningly upon the ship of the Church, and forget the nearness of the Lord. A thorough knowledge of what this means: Christ sits at the right hand of God, and a childlike faith in that truth, will dispel our fears. Instead of crying out in consternation with the disciples on the tempest-tossed Galilean sea: "Lord, save; we perish!" we will become emboldened triumphantly and defiantly to challenge all adversaries with Paul: "If God be for us, who can be against us?" Rom. 8, 31.

St. Paul prays God that the Ephesian Christians may have the eyes of their heart enlightened so that they may know, among other things, also this, what is the power of Him who sitteth at the right hand of God, and what is His relation to the Church.

"*God set Him (Christ) at His own right hand.*" God's right hand is the hand of *His power* (Matt. 24, 64), the right hand of *His majesty* (Hebr. 1, 3). Here God set Christ. Christ is God, and the divine government belonged to Him from all eternity. According to His divine nature, Christ could not be said to be *set* at God's right hand. The very word "set" indicates that this was done according to His *human* nature. The context, too, speaks of Him that was raised from the dead, v. 20a, of the man Christ. The man Christ was exalted to an unceasing participation in the divine government. (See exposition of Ps. 110, 1.) "*In heavenly places.*" This phrase does not denote a certain locality, which, by the way, would militate against God's spirituality and would

disrupt the natures in Christ, but it designates the sphere of majesty and glory in which our Lord and God lives and reigns. In the succeeding phrases and clauses the meaning of that grand thought: "Christ sits at the right hand of God in heavenly places," is most sublimely unfolded. In virtue of this participation in the divine government, Christ is "*far above all principality, and power, and might, and dominion.*" "*That these names denote angels, angels of light, is now most generally acknowledged, likewise also, that these synonymous designations do not point to an order or rank within the *hierarchia ecclesiastis . . .*, but to the superhuman power and might of the heavenly spirits.*" (Stoeckhardt.) Observe the polysyndeton: "*principality and power and might and dominion.*" That serves to make the thought emphatic. The reader is invited to ponder each concept separately in order to become all the more impressed with the marvelous power of these holy angels. However powerful they may be, aye, though all their power and might be combined, yet there is one who possesses far greater power; for "*far above*" them all is He that sits at the right hand of God, Christ, and majestically rules over them. Christ, our Brother, is on the throne of majesty. "*Why, then, are ye fearful, O ye of little faith?*"

The circle of Christ's dominion widens: He is far above "*every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come.*" That says: Christ rules over all, whatever it may be, howsoever great and powerful it may be, wherever it may be found, here in time or in eternity. Let the heathen rage and the kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord and against His Anointed—no power on earth can shake His throne.—And as if to round off his majestic thought and guard against all misconception as to what the rule of Christ, who is at the right hand of God, comprises, the apostle sweepingly asserts: "*and hath put*" in subjection, lastingly, permanently, "*all things under His feet,*" so that Christ exercises absolute sovereignty over *all things*, all creatures whatsoever, the very

devils in hell not excepted. Heaven, earth, hell—all under His feet! What a mighty Ruler this man Christ is! And this God-man is our Savior. What a sweet consolation! In the days of His flesh He said: “All power is given to me in heaven and in earth.” He proved His assertion to be true. He rebuked the winds and the waves, and there was a great calm. He cast out evil spirits with His word. The leper is cleansed of his leprosy; the centurion’s petition in behalf of his dying servant is answered. The young man at Nain is called to life; at His word, Lazarus comes from the grave. Rays of divine glory these—in the state of humiliation. Now He, the glorified Christ, is in the state of exaltation, and now He has come into the unceasing use, also according to His human nature, of the divine majesty that was always His. And He is the same Savior to-day that He was then, with the same merciful heart. Will He not guard and protect us and His Church against all enemies?

But the majestic thought of the apostle reaches its climax in the last clause: *“and gave Him to be the Head over all things to the Church, which is His body.”* In this translation the peculiar emphasis imparted by the Greek to the pronoun “Him” is lost. The original reads: *καὶ αὐτὸν ἔδωκε κεφαλὴν ὑπὲρ πάντα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, γιτις ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ* = “and *Him* He gave as Head over all things to the Church, which is His body.” *Him*—this glorious majestic Ruler just described; *Him*—who is equal with God; *Him*—to whom all, heaven, earth, and hell, is made subject: *Him God gave as Head to the Church, i. e., the communion of saints, which—Church—is His body.* He that is Head over all things as Ruler and Sovereign, Col. 2, 10, is at the same time the Head of the Church. But the headship, the rule, over the Church is entirely different from His headship over all creatures. In the kingdom of power He rules by means of His omnipotence; in the kingdom of grace He rules with His gracious Word. In the true sense of the word, as head that possesses a body, Christ is Head of His Church only, Col. 1, 18. The unbe-

lievers are not members of His spiritual body. "If any man hath not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of His," Rom. 8, 9. How great the dignity of the Church: Christ is the Head; the believers are the members of this spiritual body. As intimately as the head is connected with the body, so intimately is Christ connected with the Church. As the head governs the body, so this Head governs His body, the Church. The Church hears the Word of Truth, the Gospel of salvation, v. 13. That is Christ's voice: by it the body, the Church, is governed. Whatsoever the Head, Christ, wills, the body, the Church, executes. "One is your Master, even Christ."

But another incomparable prerogative of the Church comes out in the last phrase: the Church is "*the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.*" *Hιληπωμα* = fullness, is a rare expression. The preponderance of usage gives it the meaning "that which fills," not "that which is filled;" not the receptacle, but that which fills the receptacle. (See Stoeckhardt, *Epheserbrief*.) So the text says: The Church is "*the fullness of Him*," *i. e.*, the fullness of Christ; the Church is in full possession of the gifts of Christ. From Him, the exalted Head, the plenitude of spiritual, heavenly blessings are communicated to His body, the Church.—Note the distinction clearly marked in the text: the Church is "*the fullness of Him that filleth all in all.*" He that is *far above* all things also *fills all things*.—In passing we remark that the context speaks of Christ who died and rose again; hence the omnipresence of Christ's human nature finds expression here. Col. 1, 17.—The text says: He that *filleth all in all* = all things, also fills the Church. Christ fills all things with His efficacious presence, and from this omnipresence flows His special gracious presence with His Church.

And now, let us again ponder the emphasis in the clause: "And *Him* He gave as Head over all things to the Church, which is His body." What does this unmistakably peculiar stress say? He that is so intimately connected with His Church, He that has given His heart's blood for it as the

purchase price, He is at the same time the Ruler of the universe—heaven, earth, and hell being made subject to Him, *and He will, therefore, rule and govern all things for the benefit of the Church.* True, “now we *see* not yet all things put under His feet,” Hebr. 2, 8; it is an article of faith. Though now we do not *see* all things put under His feet, yet the fact remains. The whole course of this world is shaped for the benefit of the Church. When a building is completed, the scaffold is taken away. When the last elect has been gathered into the fold, or, to change the figure, when the last stone has been placed in God’s temple, the Church, Eph. 2, 19 ff., the scaffold of this world will be destroyed. So the whole world still stands to-day for the benefit of the Church.—When, at the time of Christ, the then known world was brought under one rule—that of the Roman emperor—highroads were built connecting the entire vast domain, commerce was established along these routes, intercourse was made comparatively easy, one language was understood by all—the Greek. These self-same means of communication the apostles used. Along these highroads they traveled, publishing the Gospel of the Kingdom in Greek, thus building the Church.—About the time of the Reformation, the invention of printing books by movable type was made—for the benefit of the Church. The Bible, Luther’s translation, could be easily and cheaply procured, and the Gospel could be widely spread. And the discovery of America—we see it *a posteriori*—was for the benefit of the Church. Here, under the providence of God, the principle of separation of Church and State became an established fact—for the benefit of the Church. Just now there are dark clouds looming up on the horizon. The elevation of three archbishops of the Catholic hierarchy to the cardinalate forebodes nothing good, neither for the Church nor for the State. But Christ sits at the right hand of God and is the Head of the Church. This is our consolation.—Even the persecutions of the Church, in the last analysis, served for the benefit of the Church. (Acts 17, 1 ff.)

In yonder life, when the mists will have lifted and our vision will have become clear, we shall see that this whole universe, the governments, the rulers, "every name that is named," lay in the hollow of His hand who sitteth at the right hand of the Father, and that all and everything was made subservient to the building of His kingdom, the Church.

CHRIST'S RETURN TO JUDGMENT.

Acts 1, 11: This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven.

To His disciples Christ "showed Himself alive after His passion by many infallible proofs, *being seen of them forty days*, and speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God," Acts 1, 3. At the completion of these forty days His ascension took place from Mount Olivet, v. 12, about two miles distant from Jerusalem. The narrative lays all stress upon the fact that Christ's ascension was a *visible* ascension and not a sudden disappearance. "And when He had spoken these things, *while they beheld*, He was taken up," v. 9. In full view of the disciples He went up gradually, and as He did so, He blessed them, Luke 24, 50, 51. He ascended higher and higher until "a cloud received Him out of their sight," v. 9. The disciples "looked steadfastly toward heaven as He went up," v. 10; they "gazed up into heaven," v. 11, following Him with their eager eyes with mixed feelings of rapt astonishment and saddened hearts.—Whither He went, the "two men that stood by them in white apparel," angels in human form, told them: "He is taken up from you into heaven," v. 11. Thus all stress is laid upon His *visible* ascension. His *visible* presence they should no longer enjoy, though *invisibly* He, the God-man, was always with them as He is still with us, according to His promise: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," Matt. 18, 20, and: "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," Matt. 28, 20.—But there will be a time when

He will return *visibly*. For so say these "two men": "*This same Jesus which is taken up from you into heaven shall so come in like manner as ye have seen Him go into heaven.*" As in the preceding verses we have a studied account of His *visible* ascension, so we have here a studied declaration of His *visible* return.—Who will return? *Θεως ὁ Ἰησοῦς.* *This Jesus, this same Jesus* who was born in Bethlehem, who suffered, was crucified and died; the same Jesus who was raised again on the third day, who was seen by them for forty days after His resurrection; the same Jesus who had just spoken to them the things pertaining to the kingdom of God, and who now visibly departed from them, this same Jesus, God's Son and Mary's son, shall come again. How? He "shall *so* come," visibly, *in like manner as ye have seen Him go*, visibly, gloriously, "into heaven." Cf. Matt. 26, 64; 24, 30; Rev. 1, 7; Matt. 25, 32.

For what purpose He will return we are told in

Acts 10, 42: *He (Christ) is ordained of God to be the Judge of quick and dead.*

Christ's own words furnish a commentary to this passage. To the Jews He had said: "For the Father judgeth no man," immediately, "but hath committed all judgment unto the Son," John 5, 25, "and hath given Him authority to execute judgment also, because He is the Son of man," v. 27.

Acts 17, 31: *God hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by that Man whom He hath ordained.*

This text is taken from St. Paul's speech at Athens on The Unknown God.—The following obvious points may be noted: 1. The certainty of Judgment Day. "God hath appointed *a day*" of judgment. And not only has a certain, definite *day* been decreed in the eternal counsels of God, but also the very *hour* in which the judgment is to take place. See Matt. 24, 36. 42 and Mark 13, 32: "that *day*," "that *hour*." This day is called "the last day," John 12, 48; "the

day of the Lord," 2 Pet. 3, 10, *et al.*—2. Christ will be the Judge. "He (God) will judge . . . by that Man whom He hath ordained," *i. e.*, Christ. (Cf. Acts 10, 42; Matt. 25, 31.)—3. It will be a judgment of the whole world. "He will judge the *world*," the "quick and dead," Acts 10, 42; "all nations," Matt. 25, 32; "all," 2 Cor. 5, 10.—4. It will be a righteous judgment. "He will judge . . . in righteousness." St. Paul calls Judgment Day "the day of wrath and revelation of the righteous judgment (*δεκαωντησίας*) of God," Rom. 2, 5. In this judgment there will be "no respect of persons with God," Rom. 2, 11; 1 Pet. 1, 17.

2 Pet. 3, 10: *But the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night; in the which the heavens shall pass away with a great noise, and the elements shall melt with ferrent heat. the earth also and the works that are therein shall be burned up.*

Speaking of "the day of the Lord," St. Peter directs our attention to three things: 1. The certainty of its coming; 2. the manner of its coming; 3. the terrors attending that day.

"*H̄z̄ει δ̄ε ή ἡμέρα* = "Come will, however, the day." The verb *h̄z̄ει* = "come will" is very emphatic, being placed at the head of the sentence, thus calling attention to the absolute certainty of this event. Why this stress? Because "there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts, and saying, Where is the promise of His coming? For since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were from the beginning of creation," vv. 3. 4. "All things continue"—that was the argument of the scoffers in Peter's days. Though Peter in the succeeding verses, in masterful fashion, has put the quietus on the cavilings of these despicable lustful fellows, the cry to-day remains the same: "All things continue!" In stentorian voice the watchmen on Zion's walls, therefore, must call out again and again: "*Come will the day!*" Do not lull yourselves into security. The promise of His coming will not fall to the ground; *come will the day!*—This day will come "*as a thief in the night.*" The point of comparison is the

sudden, unexpected advent. (Cf. Matt. 24, 27, 43; 1 Thess. 5, 2; Rev. 3, 3; 16, 15.) As a thief steals upon men at an hour when they least expect it, so "this day" will come suddenly, unexpectedly, and find most men wrapped in spiritual sleep.— When this day will come, what will happen? "*The heavens shall pass away with a great noise.*" "All things continue," say the scoffers; "the heavens shall pass away," says Peter. "To describe the dread process, he has a striking word, which, like so many of the Apostle's expressions, is used nowhere else in the New Testament, 'With a great noise,' *πολυζόδως*. It is applied to many signs of terror: to the hurtling of weapons as they fly through the air; to the sound of a lash as it is brought down for the blow; to the rushing of waters; to the hissing of serpents. He has chosen it as if by it he would unite many horrors into one." (Lumby.) Next follows the thought of nature's dissolution: "*the elements shall melt with fervent heat.*" "Elements," *στοιχεῖα*, is a difficult concept. Some commentators believe that, since "elements" are mentioned after "the heavens," the sun, the moon, and the stars are designated by that word; others again—Luther, Wahl, *et al.*—understand *στοιχεῖα* to mean the *component materials* of the world. These will "melt," be dissolved, by that fervent heat. "*The earth also and the works that are therein,*" works of nature, of art, of science, etc., "*shall be burned up.*" An irresistible fire, indeed!—The text is a warning against carnal security. "Let your loins be girded about, and your lamps burning, and ye yourselves like unto men looking for their lord," Luke 12, 35.

Mark 13, 32: *Of that day and that hour knoweth no man, no, not the angels which are in heaven, neither the Son, but the Father.*

What is the precise time of Christ's coming? It is a profound mystery. Observe the climax! No man knows, not even the *holy angels* know, yea, not even the *Son*, during the state of humiliation according to His human nature, knew of "that day and that hour."—What is the lesson contained

herein for us! The Lord Himself gives it: "Take ye heed, *watch and pray*; for ye know not when the time is," v. 33. "Watch therefore," v. 35. "And what I say unto you I say unto all. Watch!" v. 36. — Notes: 1. How futile and foolish are the attempts of those wiseacres who, with pencil and pad in hand, endeavor to compute "that day and that hour." 2. Of Christ, the God-man, we read, Matt. 9, 4: Jesus *knew* their *thoughts*; John says (2, 25): "He needed not that any one should bear witness concerning man; for He Himself *knew what was in man*." Christ is omniscient. Now if the question be asked, How is it possible that not even the Son in the state of humiliation knew of "that hour"? we answer, We don't know. It is a mystery. Scripture, the Son of God Himself, states it as a fact; by that we abide.

1 Pet. 4, 7: *The end of all things is at hand.*

These words were written well-nigh two thousand years ago. Was it a mistaken utterance? St. Paul admonishes the Philippians: "The Lord is at hand," Phil. 4, 5. St. John *hesitatingly* warns the Christians: "Little children, it is the last hour," 1 John 2, 18. Have Peter, Paul, and John erred? Let Dr. Walther answer: "We durst not imagine that the holy apostles have erred here: they cried out: 'The Lord is at hand!' and still they knew full well that millenniums might pass before the Lord's return. For example, when St. Peter had spoken of the nearness of Christ's Second Advent, he added: 'But be not ignorant of this one thing, that one day is with the Lord as a thousand years, and a thousand years as one day.' And St. Paul, after proclaiming the nearness of the last day, nevertheless adds: 'Let no man deceive you by any means: for that day shall not come, except there come a falling away first, and that man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition.' But . . . why, notwithstanding, could the apostles speak so clearly concerning the nearness of the end of the world? Because they did not speak man's language, but God's language; before God the end is *at hand* even though millenniums must still pass by." (Ep. Post., p. 255.)

2 Cor. 5, 10: *We must all appear before the judgment-seat of Christ, that every one may receive the things done in his body, according to that he hath done, whether it be good or bad.*

"We must all," none excepted, "*appear*," rather, "*be manifested, be made manifest*," appear in our true character, before the judgment-seat of Christ. Why? In the sight of God we all are at all times manifest: He need not institute this judgment for His sake to find out where we stand. In that great panorama of the Last Day unrolled before our eyes in Matt. 25, the separation between the sheep and the goats is made *before* the sentence is pronounced. This judgment is to be a public judgment to vindicate God's righteousness, to prove that "He judgeth the world in righteousness," Acts 17, 31. Unerring justice will be meted out on that day. The very damned themselves, conscience-smitten, must concede: My damnation is just. — How will that be effected? The judgment will be based upon the works of man, "*according to that he hath done, whether good or bad*." "God will render to every man *according to his deeds*," Rom. 2, 6. God, "without respect of persons, judgeth *according to every man's work*," 1 Pet. 1, 17. The outward semblance of having been Christians will not save; hypocrisy will be no cloak here. The works are manifest proofs of man's sentiment, whether he was for Christ or against Christ. The good works of the believers will be produced in evidence of their faith; the evil works of the unbelievers, in evidence of their unbelief. Thus the doctrine: Through grace by faith in Christ are ye saved, is not subverted, does not clash with this or similar passages. — But will the evil works of Christians also be brought to light on that great day? No. In that sublime account of the final judgment, Matt. 25, the Lord speaks of the *good* works only of those on His right hand, thus proving their relation to Him, showing that their faith bore fruits. (See Ezek. 33, 13; Is. 43, 25; Jer. 31, 34; Hebr. 10, 17; Is. 38, 17.) — In passing, may it be said that these good works of the Christians

are in no way to be looked upon as being meritorious. Before praising the good works of those on His right, the Lord does not say: "Come, for ye have *merited* the kingdom," but His words are: "Come, ye blessed of my Father, *inherit* the kingdom prepared for you from the foundation of the world," Matt. 25, 34. So, then, the good works of the children of God are considered only as fruits and proofs of faith which can be recognized also by men. "In this the children of God are *manifest*, and the children of the devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother," 1 John 3, 10.

John 12, 48: *The word that I have spoken, the same shall judge him in the last day.*

This is the rule of judgment: Christ's Word. This same Word that we now hear, read, study, this same Word "shall judge him" who despises Christ "in the last day." What is that rule stated in other words? "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned," Mark 16, 16. Or, to quote another passage: "He that believeth on Him (Christ) is not condemned; but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only-begotten Son of God," John 3, 18.

Springfield, Ill.

LOUIS WESSEL.

(To be continued.)

CURRENT EVENTS.

THE LUTHERAN QUARTERLY (vol. 42, p. 138) says of the series of articles on the "Proof Texts of the Catechism" which we have been publishing for some time: "As a practical exposition this commentary is hard to excel. We hope it will appear in book form." The same reviewer is also favorably impressed with the articles on "Romanism a Plagiarism on Paganism."

A ST. LOUIS DAILY quotes from a published statement of Lutheran ministers regarding the Men and Religion Forward Movement as follows:—

"We cannot understand why any thinking man cannot realize the seriousness of conditions. The case is plain and simple enough if duly considered. If, for instance, the doctrine of the apostolic succession of the Episcopal Church is Scriptural, then we preachers who have not been ordained by an Episcopalian bishop have no right whatever to be and remain incumbents of the holy office of the ministry. If the doctrine of immersion, so tenaciously held by the Baptist Church, is Scriptural, then all we who have not been immersed are not baptized. If the doctrine of an election to eternal damnation, taught by the Calvinists, is Scriptural, then we are deceiving the people by preaching that Jesus died for all sinners, and that God will have all men to be saved."

The paper goes on to say: "The Lutheran belief in the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures and in the doctrine that the body and blood of Christ are present and orally partaken of in the Sacrament by all communicants is emphasized."

The document of the Lutheran ministers is quoted once more, to this effect: "That these and many similar differences should not be worthy of recognition and of the most prayerful and careful consideration on the part of all Christians and lovers of the truth and their Lord, and sufficient ground to preclude cooperation of these among whom these differences exist, and until they no longer exist, is difficult to be understood by all such as have learned the Word of Truth and have learned to stand for a definite theology on the basis of such Word of Truth, it being the unerring inspired Word of God."

The Lutheran document was prepared by our brethren of the Long Island Pastoral Conference and was addressed to the Committee of One Hundred representing the Men and Religion Forward Movement, and has made a favorable impression, because, "while clearly showing doctrinal differences between Lutherans and those denominations promoting this movement, it is courteously worded," and asks to be considered "in the same Christian and charitable spirit in which it is written."

REV. O. WISMAR, of New Orleans, and *Rev. A. Kaub*, of Dallas, have been compelled to meet the false claims of Romanists in the daily press of their respective cities. The character of the strife was as usual: Truth and plain facts on our side, equivocation and distortion of facts on the other side. Rome is plainly bent on rewriting the history of the world and the Church in its own interest. It is "making history" in our country in more than one sense.

REV. RUHLAND, of Ottawa, Can., sends us press reports regarding the *Ne Temere* decree, as follows:—

“Quebec, January 23.—The marriage question appeared again in the Provincial Legislature at yesterday afternoon’s sitting, when Hon. Jeremie Decarie, Provincial Secretary, replied to several questions that had been put by Mr. Godfrey Langlois.

“Hon. Mr. Decarie said that the decree of the Council of Trent respecting marriage had been promulgated in this province in 1700 by Mgr. St. Valier, and that the Government had not considered the desirability of legislation legalizing marriages contracted by two Catholics before a Protestant minister.

“Mr. Langlois’ query read: ‘Is it the Government’s intention to amend the civil code so as henceforth to render valid any marriage between two contracting parties belonging to different religious creeds or to the same creed when celebrated before any officer duly qualified to celebrate marriage?’

“The reply of the Government was that the matter had not been considered.”

Still the Roman Church has lost one case in court which affects the *Ne Temere* decree. The famous Hebert marriage had been annulled by Justice Larendeau, after Archbishop Bruchesi of Montreal had published the pope’s decree. Later, Justice Charbonneau declared the “marriage valid in the eyes of the civil law.” The decision of the justice plainly deprecates interference on the part of Rome with the civil rights of persons. This drew a reply from the Archbishop of Montreal, on February 26, who said, in part:—

“The agitation carried on from one end of our country to the other, the more or less violent articles appearing in several Protestant newspapers against the wise and beneficent, yet evidently ill-understood, legislation of the Catholic Church, and the deductions gathered from a recent judgment of the civil courts, impose upon me the duty to raise my voice, not for the purpose of trying to interpret the text of human laws, but in order to solemnly affirm the ever immutable principles of our faith touching the august sacrament of marriage as well as the sacred legislation of the Church which neither jurists’ thesis nor the findings of civil tribunals can ever abrogate or modify. . . .

“Marriage, like all other sacraments, belongs to the Church, and consequently it belongs to the Church to direct everything that concerns the validity of marriage. Such was the doctrine of the Catholic Church before the Protestant Reformation, and such will it be in all time. If, however, our separate brethren have rejected it, if they have made marriage a simple contract submitted, like all others, to

the civil powers, which may dissolve or govern at its will, let them at least allow us to remain faithful to our secular traditions, and in the name of that liberty which they claim for themselves let them permit us to act according to the convictions of our faith.

“Whatever happens, the holy laws of the Church on the marriage question will always continue to bind the conscience of its children, *and these alone, in the eyes of the Church, will be worthy of the title of husband and wife who will have contracted a marriage according to her forms and rulings.*”

On the same day, Bishop Fallon of St. Thomas was foolish enough to utter the following:—

“What have we done to deserve these attacks? Why are we pilloried in the press? Are we not of the same flesh and blood as non-Catholics? What have we done? *Only what Christ had done when they cried, ‘Crucify Him!’ and what the first Christians had done when they said: ‘The Christians to the lions!’* Catholics are used to these attacks, but I am getting sick and tired, and I want to take this opportunity of protesting.

“The *Ne Temere* decree is an arrangement *purely* for the Catholic people, affecting their conscience, and *having no more to do with the civil law than the man in the moon.*”

We might call this a “retreat with flying colors,” but it is a retreat—until a more convenient season for an advance shall have arrived.

Just as this issue is going to press, the announcement is being made that the pope is preparing a letter repealing the *Ne Temere* decree.

AUGUSTANA editorially attacks the claim that a pastor must be guided by popular opinion. It says: “Folkets röst är Guds röst (*i. e., vox populi, vox Dei*), this saying is one of the tallest lies which ‘the father of lies’ has uttered in this world.” The article goes on to show what this saying, taken seriously, meant in the days of the French Revolution. It points out the unpopular position occupied by Noah in his age, by Moses in Egypt and in the desert, by Elijah over and against the Baal-worshipers, by the ancient prophets who invariably represented the minority in their day, by John Baptist, by the Lord, whom a popular decision rejected for Barabbas, etc. Yes, the voice of the people is not the voice of God, *except when God’s people repeat what God has spoken.* The pastor surely misses his calling who sets out to be popular, except with the children of God. According to Matt. 5, 12, it is a blessed thing when a pastor is reviled and evil spoken of *for Christ’s sake.*—On the other hand, 1 Tim. 3, 2 requires of the pastor that he be *ποιητικός*,

which Wilke renders "*bene compositus, decorus, modestus.*" *Kloping* does not mean "worldly," and, in that sense, popular. Bishop Horrey paraphrased it: "with a due proportion in his life, modest in deportment, courteous to all, of a calm temper and grave demeanor." A circumspect walk, a good report among them that are without,—these are the Scriptural limits to pastoral inspiration for popularity. These can be gained, by the grace of the Lord, by the humblest pastor, and they necessitate no sacrifice of principle or consistency. But any popularity purchased at a moral sacrifice is a burden to the conscience, and, in addition, a poor bargain, even from a worldly point of view; for popular favor is an ephemeral thing, a breath, a vapor. Even Cicero and Virgil understood the worthlessness of the "*aurae popularum.*"

THE PRESBYTERIANS OF ATLANTA, GA., are making an effort to secure for their city the simultaneous meeting of the four Assemblies of the Presbyterian Church in 1913. *The Presbyterian* scorns the idea "that the movers in the matter had designs toward organic union," but has no objection if a union can be effected. "The evil to be avoided is trickery and any manner of force. If everything is ripe for it, let there be a union; if not, let there be none." All of which suggests the lines of the German poet: "Ich ging im Walde so für mich hin, und nichts zu suchen, das war mein Sinn," etc. Accidents will happen. It is just possible that these four Presbyterian bodies, *happening* to meet in the same place, without any design, may *happen* to unite. And that will be the "trickery" of it. Aye, aye, there is much "trickery," little religiousness, in modern union movements.

PROF. MILTON S. TERRY, in his "Biblical Dogmatics" (p. 8), scorns Quenstedt's and Carpzov's presentation of the divine impulse by which the Scriptures came to be written. He says: "Along with the old rabbinic and allegorical exegesis, there was also begotten a theory of Biblical inspiration which in course of time has taken to itself such qualifying terms as *verbal, inerrant, and infallible.* It has affirmed that the sacred writers were impulsive instruments in the hands of God, and that every word and letter of the Bible were supernaturally dictated by the omniscient Spirit. Thus Quenstedt, in 1685, declared that 'all things which were to be written were suggested by the Holy Spirit to the sacred writers in the very net of writing, and were dictated to their intellect as if unto a pen (*quasi in calatum*), so that they could be written in no other circumstances, in this and no other mode or order' (*Theologia Didact.*, IV, 2). Carpzov, in 1728, declared that the divine Power

'impelled the will' of the Biblical writers, and 'directed their hands that they might write infallibly' (*Critica Sacra Vet. Test.*, p. 43)."

This is a fair specimen of the superficial work of modern scientific theology. Note the nonchalant way of giving references: "Theologia Didact." is amusing; "IV, 2" is hilarious. The words to which Prof. Terry refers are in Part I, cap. IV, Sect. II, quodest. 3 in the thesis, page 68 of the Wittenberg edition of 1685. Note also the scholarly rendering of the common Latin phrase "*in calamum dictilare*." Remember, lastly, that Quenstedt's treatise, *De Scriptura Sacra*, runs through nearly 200 pages folio closely printed (pp. 53—240), and that it is one of the most searching studies extant on what the Bible says in plain words, or reveals by unavoidable inference, regarding its origin,—and you have an idea of the "scientific" outrage perpetrated by the above quotation. And now, try to fathom the possible connection between Quenstedt's presentation of the theopneustic and "the old rabbinical and allegorical exegesis."—Possibly, Prof. Terry's citation was obtained at second hand. We do not suspect him of having read Quenstedt or Carpzov.

PROF. NICHOLAUS M. STEFFENS in *The Christian Intelligencer* discusses the question, "Is Christianity a Synereticistic Religion?" and refers to the interesting derivation of the term "syneretism," whether it is to be traced to a verb *συγκρητίζειν*, "to do as the Cretans do," or to *συγκρητίσσειν*, "to commingle." He says:

"What was the original meaning of syneretism? Plutarch tells us that syneretisize means to act under certain circumstances as the Cretans did. When Cretans quarreled among themselves, which frequently was the case, and a third party tried to interfere, they united and fought against the intruder.

"In the history of the Church we find that the term was applied to union movements, which were a result of the threatening disintegration of the Church and the resulting loss of its visible unity.

"In the formative period of the Reformation of the sixteenth century, when many earnest men deplored the breaking up of the visible unity of the Church of Christ, synereticistic movements were the order of the day. Some optimistic lovers of Church unity, *e. g.*, the theologian Calixtus and the philosopher Leibnitz, did not despair of a reunion of Roman Catholics and Protestants. Melanchthon, perhaps, is the model of this kind of syneretism, for he was even willing to submit to the pope and his hierarchy if Protestants were permitted to preach the doctrine of justification by faith only.

"Later, however, during the time of the fierce dogmatic controversies between Lutheran and Reformed theologians, syneretism

was not in favor. The great champions of Neo-Scholasticism denounced all attempts to unite the two branches of the Protestant Church. According to their idea of syncretism a union between the Reformed and the Lutheran Churches would necessarily result in a mixture of heterogeneous elements. They even went so far as to derive the term syncretism from a Greek verb which means to mix. The Evangelical unionists of our day, however, cling to the original meaning of the term, a little modified perhaps, desirous as they are to enlist all the Christian forces against the common enemy.

"It does not enter their minds to look upon Christianity as a syncretistic religion. Is it not strange that the orthodox teachers of the Neo-Scholastic period and the radical propagandists of the so-called new theology of our own time should hold the same view of syncretism? Truly, extremes meet. But the old teachers would never have consented that Christianity pure and simple has to be looked upon as a syncretistic religion. They objected to a mixture of different tendencies of Christianity because they believed that they had found in their system the correct conception of Christianity; hence they feared an adulteration of the genuine article by an admixture of less valuable materials. The new theologians, however, have no scruples of this kind."

The history of the term, with the documentary evidence, is given in the Henke-Wagemann articles of *Protestantische Real-Encyklopädie*. Regardless of the derivation, the preponderance of modern usage has assigned to syncretism a meaning synonymous with unionism, indifferentism, agree-to-disagree policy. This, of course, favors the derivation from *συγκεράννυμι*, and it is a question whether those who accept this derivation ought not to write syncretism instead of syncretism. The *Standard Dictionary* still derives the term from *συγκρητίζειν*.

Prof Steffens, in the article aforementioned, has some pertinent remarks and criticisms on the syncretistic tendency of the new theology.

"They maintain that Christianity is not a pure and simple religion as we have thought, but a mixture of many religious elements taken from all the religions of the world, and they are of the opinion that even in our day Christian theologians ought to be willing to learn and to assimilate much from other religions or systems of philosophy, especially from the great religions of the world. I quote from a Manual of Theology, which is one of the best of its kind, the following: 'From all religions, Christian theology can learn something, and from the great religions much, even though it can teach them more.' A speculative theologian who ignores the Scriptural

principle may, perhaps, in building up his philosophico-theological system, learn something from Buddhism, Hinduism, Confucianism, and other human systems of religion, but a theologian who finds the fountain of truth in the revelation of God in His Word has only one Master, and is willing to sit at His feet, who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life. A theologian whose aim it is to present the Christian religion, pure and undefiled, will probably concede that formally and historically theologians derive something from non-Christian sources, and none will deny that in the formative period of the old Catholic Church the Greek church-fathers have not in vain studied the works of Plato, Aristotle, and even Pontinus, and have thereby been enabled to handle the problems that came up in their days in a scholarly manner; but materially, ethничal religions do not contribute anything to Christianity. In the works of the church-fathers may be found here and there traces of the influence of their contemporaneous philosophers, as Kant and Hegel have exerted an influence in their times; but it is not Christianity as a religion which has been developed into a more comprehensive religion than it was before. There is development of our knowledge of God's truth, but there is no evolution of new truths brought about by the studies of the theologians of the religio-historical school. It is the philosophical theology of modern theologians which is syncretistic, but by no means the Christian religion. The more conservative among modern theologians allow that Christianity is an original religion, which in the course of time has absorbed all the better elements of other religions; but the more radical among them assert that Christianity is nothing but an aggregate of all kinds of doctrines and maxims. What do you say about the following definition of a syncretistic religion? 'A syncretistic religion is a religion which consists of a combination of elements taken over substantially unchanged from earlier faiths, and without any distinctive character or new contribution of its own.' Is Christianity such a crazy-quilt of many and manifold bits of religious odds and ends? The above-quoted definition certainly cannot be applied to Christianity. Such a mechanical aggregate of parts which have no organic connection would resemble a mosaic rather than a living religion. I wonder whether anywhere such a religion is found. And yet the theologian from whose manual I have quoted finds it at least *plausible* to look upon Christianity as a syncretistic religion.

"The great mistake the new theologians make consists in emphasizing natural religion and the development of all existing religions, Christianity included, in harmony with the theory of evolution. It is revived Deism and Rationalism. Natural religion

is the religion of the natural man, who is in rebellion against God. It is on this account that all ethical religions have many things in common. They all are perversions of the truth. Left to our natural religious instincts, we never find God; for only he who beholds the Son beholds the Father. No man cometh to the Father but by our blessed Savior, the only-begotten Son of God. Christianity is God's gift to lost man. Christianity only is the remedial scheme whereby man is restored to primitive simplicity and future glory. It is the only true religion, which will be hailed by such who as sinners look for a way to God, and as saints desire to walk in this way the Father has disclosed to them in His infinite mercy. To call Christianity a syncretistic religion is a libel of the grossest kind and an act of the basest ingratitude to God for His unspeakable gift. Has theology to build up our Christian religion, developing it up to date with the help of the vagaries of the perverted mind and imagination of fallen man? The Lord forbid! Our great task is to find out more and more the simplicity and sublimity of the only true religion, revealed to us in Christ."

PRECISION AND DECISION have always been regarded as indispensable requisites for effectual teaching. A discussion between two prominent scholars in London partly turns on this matter, and leads the *Presbyterian* to say editorially:—

"There has been considerable complaint on the part of students, especially in our theological seminaries, because of certain indefiniteness in the instruction. The teachers cite a variety of opinion on certain points, and then leave the students uninformed as to which is true, or as to whether the positions cited are true.

"This is unfair to the student, and untrue to the teachers' responsibility. Men are put into teachers' chairs, not simply to cite opinions, but to teach truths and give the reasons therefor. In fact, when a teacher cites an opinion without disapproval, it means approval, or else it has no significance, and is a foolish action.

"But it is to be feared that this practice is due to cowardice upon the part of the teacher. Believing, for himself, certain things which are contrary to the purpose of the chair he occupies, the teacher cites those things, and thus, having left them in the mind of the student to do their baneful work, he lacks courage to carry them out to full argument.

"The teacher who is employed to teach any subject should be informed upon that subject. He should be able to set forth truth and errors pertaining to it, and to defend the one and disprove the other.

"There are points in all subjects which remain uncertain and

undecided. Then the teacher should be honest, and acknowledge the limitations. Nothing is more mischievous toward a student, mentally and morally, than to cultivate indefiniteness and uncertainty. Harold M. Weiner, a well-known critic of London, in a reply to Dr. Driver, has this to say, which is both sane and helpful:—

“What would any junior student understand by this? One view is mentioned, only to be rejected; certain views are cited without any suggestion that there is any objection to them, or any warning as to adopting them; and other interpretations are not even mentioned. A commentator who puts forward certain views without objective question, warning, expression of doubt, or alternative, must be held to recommend those views. Surely, he cannot be supposed to put them forward because he does not adopt them. Surely, too, no schoolboy would suspect that the commentator regards them as incorrect. If the commentator does not believe the interpretations he himself adduces without doubt or question, what on earth does he believe or mean his readers to believe?”

“We are persuaded that Weiner is right, and that he hits a practice that is as mischievous as it is common in both oral and written instruction.”

Definiteness in teaching is the fruit of definite beliefs. A theology of doubt, skepticism, and denial must of necessity lead to indefiniteness in teaching. A theologian speaks with authority and finality when he speaks after Him of whom it is written: “He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes.”

IN THESE DAYS OF FERMENT AND AGITATION in the churches it is well to be reminded of a saying of Peloubet, the well-known author of religious literature for the young:—

“There is a continual temptation to-day for Christian workers to give up their time and strength to discussing the many theories and unsettled questions which are continually confronting them. All sorts of men say all sorts of things, till it seems as if these clouds were obscuring the whole continent of truth. This is true of many other things besides religion. Now, the way to escape from these snares is to attend to our duties; to go to work for the cause of Christ with all our hearts; to give ourselves to helping save our fellow-men, both body and soul. For then we will use the essential things by which our work is accomplished. We thus test the working theories by using them. Those principles that bring results are the ones we want. We find out what they are worth through testing them by what they will do. Working for Christ and for His children is our safeguard.”

WINSTON CHURCHILL, author of some stirring historical novels that have delighted Americans ("Richard Carvel," "The Crisis," "The Crossing," "Coniston"), is reported to be advocating "Christian Anarchism." Says *The Presbyterian*:—

"But Mr. Churchill magnifies the individual over society, and states that the essence of Christianity is the placing of authority in the individual soul. He attempts this definition: 'The Christian ideal is the least possible government, a government wherein neither you nor I, nor any other man or woman, will labor and obey because we have to, but because we have learned the lesson which Christ taught, that happiness lies alone in service, in giving to the world that which God gave us.'

"Mr. Churchill says many things that are true. But he is dreaming of a time when the Kingdom of Glory shall be fulfilled, when there shall be a new earth, 'wherein dwelleth righteousness,' when the Sermon on the Mount has been realized, when men will have become perfect, even as their Father in heaven is perfect. He skips over the period through which we are now passing, when evil is still battling with good, darkness with light, and sin with righteousness. It would be well to remember what our Lord said: 'Render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's, and unto God the things that are God's;' and the words of the Apostle, when he said: 'The powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever resisteth the power resisteth the ordinance of God;' and again: 'The Law is not made for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient.' When all men are righteous, Mr. Churchill's dream or ideal will be realized. The great work now is to have men become righteous. And this is the present work of Christianity and the Church. 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness, and all these things will be added unto you.'"

Even after "the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness," *i. e.*, the life everlasting, after the consummation of this present world, will have come, there will be neither "anarchism" nor "Christian anarchism." The Lord God omnipotent will reign even then, over His saints in glory, over His enemies in justice.

OUR PRESENT PRESIDENT PLAINLY A TOOL OF ROME.—The following official documents are making history in our Republic at the present time. To the well-informed and observing they merely confirm past impressions, *viz.*, that Rome held both, the past and the present, incumbents of the presidential office in her leading strings. The documents read:—

“DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, OFFICE COMMISSIONER OF
INDIAN AFFAIRS.

“Circular No. 601.

Washington, January 27, 1912.

“Religious Insignia.

“*To Superintendents in charge of Indian Schools:—*

“In accordance with that essential principle in our national life, the separation of Church and State, as applied by me to the Indian Service, which as to ceremonies and exercises is now being enforced under the existing religious regulations, I find it necessary to issue this order supplementary to those regulations, to cover the use at those exercises, and at other times, of insignia and garb as used by various denominations. At exercises of any particular denomination there is, of course, no regulation in this respect, but at the general assembly exercises and in the public school-rooms, or on the grounds when on duty, insignia or garb has no justification.

“In government schools all insignia of any denomination must be removed from all public rooms, and members of any denomination wearing distinctive garb should leave such garb off while engaged at lay duties as government employees. If any case exists where such an employee cannot conscientiously do this, he will be given a reasonable time, not to extend, however, beyond the opening of the school-year after the date of this order, to make arrangements for employment elsewhere than in Federal Indian schools.

“Respectfully,

“ROBERT G. VALENTINE.”

This just order, which was in absolute harmony with the spirit and letter of our basic law, and in keeping with our past history, President Taft has, after a visit from a certain Rev. Ketcham at the White House, rescinded by the following letter to the Secretary of the Interior:—

“*My Dear Mr. Secretary:—*

“It has been brought to my attention that an order has been issued by the Commission of Indian Schools. This order relates to the general matter which you and I have had under consideration and concerning which, at your request, the commissioner was collecting detailed information for our advice. The commissioner’s order has been made without consultation either with you or with me. It not only prohibits the use of distinctive religious insignia at school exercises, but also the wearing of distinctive religious garb by school employees, and provides that if any school employee cannot conscientiously comply with the order, such employee will be given a reasonable time, not to extend, however, beyond the opening of the next school-year, to make arrangements for employment elsewhere

than in Federal Indian schools. I fully believe in the principle of the separation of Church and State on which our Government is based, but the questions presented by this order are of great importance and delicacy. They arise out of the fact that the Government has for a considerable period taken for the use of the Indian certain schools theretofore belonging to, and conducted by, distinctive religious societies or churches. As a part of the arrangements then made the school employees, who were in certain cases members of religious orders, wearing the distinctive garb of these orders, were continued as teachers by the Government, and by ruling of the Civil Service Commission or by executive action they have been included in the classified service under the protection of the Civil Service law. The commissioner's order almost necessarily amounts to a discharge from the Federal service of those who have entered it. This should not be done without a careful consideration of all phases of the matter, nor without giving the persons directly affected an opportunity to be heard. As the order would not in any event take effect until the beginning of the next school-year, I direct that it be revoked, and that action by the Commissioner of Indian Affairs in respect thereto be suspended until such time as will permit a full hearing to be given to all parties in interest, and a conclusion to be reached in respect to the matter after full deliberation.

"Sincerely yours,

"(Signed) WILLIAM H. TAFT."

Before the foregoing order of the President was issued, Chas. L. Thompson, President of the Home Mission Council of National Protestant Mission Boards and Societies, had addressed the following telegram to the President:—

"The White House, Washington, D. C.

"The President:—

"The action of the Honorable Commissioner of Indian Affairs issued January twenty-seventh relative to sectarian insignia and garb in Federal Indian schools, is to our minds so manifestly American in spirit, judicial and righteous, that we heartily approve and commend it. We did not know that such an order was in preparation. But we now express our commendation and ask that nothing be permitted to weaken its force. We desire our representatives to have a conference with you if you find opportunity and occasion for this."

This request for a conference was not granted.

THE LITERARY DIGEST, with its customary partiality to the Catholics, claims that no Protestant journal has disapproved of President Taft's act in suspending Commissioner Valentine's order

to enforce a common rule of our country so far as it applied to his office. *The Literary Digest* in this case has not waited to hear and digest Protestant opinion. Here is one from *The Presbyterian* of February 28:—

“Some of our government officials have been guilty of partiality and inconsistency. President Taft made a great mistake when he recently reversed the order of the Commissioner of Indian Education. Commissioner Valentine simply gave the general order that, while teachers were doing lay work in the service of the nation, they must not display church insignia. This order was not in the interest of any party or sect, but common to all. But President Taft reversed it, giving as his reason that the parties should be heard before the order was given. We see no reason for this as it is only the statement of an American principle long since established — the separation of Church and State. Neither Mr. Taft nor any other man could pass upon this principle or the expression of it. The commissioner was simply doing his duty.”

THE TRUTH SEEKER, of New York, is quite correct when it values President Taft’s claim that in spite of his suspension of Commissioner Valentine’s order he believes in the separation of Church and State, at the following heavy discount: “As a government employee, the teacher represents the state. In wearing the religious garb, the employee represents the Church. Church and State are united in that employee, and anybody, whether President or priest, who would permit such a union *is not honest* when affirming his belief in separation.” We cast our humble vote the same way. We think the President’s assurance is not worth the paper it was written on. *Facta loquuntur.*

HERE IS A WHITE RAVEN. In discussing the dangerous pressure and arrogant demands of Romanism in our country, an anonymous writer in *The Presbyterian* says:—

“If we — Protestants of every name — are to hold our heritage, is not the great struggle of the Reformation to be fought over again? It is clear to every one who has watched the drift of religious thought for the last quarter of a century that the doctrine of salvation by works in some form is rapidly taking the place of the Scriptural teaching of salvation by grace. Within the more pronounced Protestant churches there has been a growing rejection of the atoning sacrifice of Christ, with the substitution of salvation by personal character; or, as one preacher has announced it, ‘every man his own savior.’

“With Rome and the Romanizing bodies, Christ and His atone-

ment are not so much denied as they are buried under the wood, hay, and stubble of sacerdotal rites. These are the facts confronting evangelical Christendom to-day. They are not trifles. How are they to be met? Is the Gospel of Christ to be crucified between the two malefactors, infidelity and superstition? Luther was right when he said that *Justification by Faith* was the article of a standing or a falling Church. All our activities cannot save us if we abandon the foundation of human hope."

Rome *does* deny dogmatically the atonement of Christ for actual sins, besides burying it in the manner stated above. It is only when this fact is understood that Rome's true character is seen. Rome is "the mystery of iniquity," "the man of sin," "the son of perdition," and Antichrist, because it nullifies the entire work of Christ. Rome destroys the authority of the civil powers, but this is as nothing to the destruction which it has wrought in the Church of God. For this reason Luther prayed: "*Deus vos impleat odio papae!*" That prayer was not inspired by vengefulness or malice, but by a clear insight into the real inwardness of the papacy. One might wish that such knowledge of Romanism as is exhibited in the above quotation might spread among all the Christian churches of our country. It is very, very rare.

AT THE OFFICE OF THE AMERICAN CITIZEN, 120 Tremont St., Boston, Mass., a letter is exhibited to any one who will call to inspect it. The letter was sent to a Protestant who had been mistaken for a Romanist. The letter requires no comment. We offer it as collateral evidence to the truth of things that have been published in the QUARTERLY for the last three years. This is the letter:—

DIRECTORS OF THE CATHOLIC MISSIONARY UNION.

MOST REV. J. M. FARLEY, D. D.,
Archbishop of New York, Pres.

MOST REV. JOHN IRELAND, D. D.,
Archbishop of St. Paul.

RT. REV. MATTHEW HARKINS,
Bishop of Providence, R. I.

VERY REV. E. R. DYER, S. S.,
Pres. St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore.

REV. MATTHEW A. TAYLOR.

VERY REV. A. P. DOYLE,
Secretary-Treasurer.

REV. WALTER ELLIOTT,
of the Paulist Fathers.

Represented by **THE CATHOLIC MISSIONARY UNION.** *Under its Auspices*
THE MISSIONARY. **The Catholic Missionary Union.** *The Apostolic Mission House.*

Washington, Brookland Station, D. C., February 6, 1912.

My Dear Friend:—

How near at hand do you think is the time when America will be dominantly Catholic? Things move on with rapid strides these days, and the recent creating of three American cardinals has brought the Church once more to the forefront. The dominant note in the

address of the Holy Father as well as in the replies of the cardinals is the hope of wonderful progress among English-speaking peoples. They have all spoken of "the era of convert-making." All this indicates a marvelous advance along the lines whereon the missionaries of the Apostolic Mission House have been working these twenty years.

If all the priests and laity would turn their faces to this one goal, what a tremendous impetus the movement would get! One of our great leaders recently said—and there is a burning truth in it: "We must labor to gain the confidence, love, and respect of the American people. This once gained, the Catholic Church, in her way to claim the American heart, may carry a thousand dogmas on her back."

Last year our missionaries gave hundreds of missions, and the record of convert-making is now away beyond the thirty-five thousand mark each year. Just think what this means! This estimate says nothing of the thousands of fallen-away Catholics that have been brought back to a good life.

Come with us and share the glories of this work!

Sincerely yours in Xto,

Catholic Missionary Union.

A. P. DOYLE, *Treasurer.*

A GREAT "IF."—Not so long ago prominent men in the Presbyterian Church were pooh-poohing the idea of Roman domination in our country. Charles Francis Greene, in reviewing some anti-Roman literature for the *Princeton Review* two years ago, remarked: "What would happen if the majority of our American citizens were devout Roman Catholics, seems to us somewhat like the question, 'If the skies were to fall, would we all catch larks?'" There seems to have occurred a slight awakening of late; for *The Presbyterian* is beginning to take notice of the growing Roman influence at Washington. But even now this journal, noting the concern of *Zion's Herald*, New England's Methodist paper, about the designs of Romanism on America, says: "We have much sympathy with the concern shown by our contemporary. But the spirit of liberty and tolerance is too strongly entrenched in our American life to allow such a conquest." And then the paper goes on to say, clearly admitting the existence of the danger which it has minimized: "If Protestantism will bestir itself and rise to its true self, it can neither be uprooted nor conquered. . . . If Protestants stand true to their position, any attempt of Catholicism to subdue this land will be met by such reaction as will repeat Catholic experience in other nations." In our opinion these "ifs" deserve to be writ large with a

great question-mark behind them. Protestantism has in many quarters thrown away its only efficient weapon for attacking Rome, the inspired Word of God. In other quarters it has been lulled into the fatal sleep of indifferentism and security. Now that the call is heard throughout the land: Beware of Rome! many Protestants act like drowsy people who are unwilling to be roused, and many pretend to see nothing worth fighting for. Besides, the prospect of history repeating itself in our country, as regards the old war of the nations against Rome's cunning and violence, is not a pleasant one.—The men of the present generation have reason to ask themselves what their children will think of them fifty years hence, if Rome keeps up her present aggressiveness in our country. The greatest danger, however, arising from an ascendancy of Rome in our country, is a spiritual and religious, not a political one, though that is great enough. Modern Protestantism has ceased to regard the papacy as "the mystery of iniquity," the destroyer of God's truth and of the sinner's righteousness by faith in Christ Jesus.



BOOK REVIEW.

Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo., announces the following publications:—

1. **BIBEL NR. 1912.** In three styles, at \$1.50, \$2.75, and \$4.00, 40 cts. carriage additional.

This is a German family Bible, reproducing faithfully Luther's version, only the old orthography having been changed to the modern. The Bible text is in fairly large, clear-cut, characteristic letters, and well printed on thin paper of sufficient consistency to carry ink. By this device the bulk of the book has been considerably reduced. All prominent texts have been printed in bold-face type. The book contains 240 illustrations of Schnorr von Carolsfeld, struck from good plates. The Apocrypha are printed in smaller type. Ten Biblical charts are added at the end, and a family chronology has been provided at the front. The binding is strong and yielding, the cover is embossed with a chastely ornate design. All features considered, the price is a marvel of cheapness. We do not know of a possible competitor of this beautiful Bible in the book-market of to-day, and we do not believe that its excellencies can be surpassed in the near future. It is one of the most creditable products which Concordia Publishing House has yet brought forward.

2. LENTEN PRAYERS. Compiled by *Rev. R. W. Huebsch*.
40 pages; 35 cts.

Sixty-three prayers from Rambach's *Meditations and Contemplations on the Sufferings of Our Lord* are here offered in a good translation, and in a plain but tasteful little book.

3. LEHRBUCH DER DEUTSCHEN SPRACHE fuer hoehere Schulen
von *August Crull*. Third revised edition. XII and
234 pages; 85 cts.

In twelve years the first edition of Crull's *Lehrbuch* was exhausted; half that time sufficed to exhaust the second edition. This was possible with the limited market of our own synodical constituency, and shows the increasing demand for this book. This book deserves a national market. The students of German in America can find no book of its kind produced in our country which offers such wealth of information and exercise in as practical form as this one, and it is a question whether they could import a better one.

4. HILFSBUCH ZUR BIBLISCHEN GESCHICHTE fuer die Hand des
Lehrers, im Anschluss an "Biblische Geschichten fuer
Mittelklassen und gemischte Schulen" bearbeitet von
Wilh. Simon, ev.-luth. Lehrer zu Schaumburg, Ill. XV
and 503 pages; \$1.65.

Director Lindemann, in expounding the method to be followed by the instructor in Bible History, has laid down some excellent rules. His first and fundamental rule is, that the teacher *study* in the evening the lesson which he is to explain the next day. This may sound trite. Of course, we say, the teacher *must* study. But study is a relative term, at least, it practically becomes such. Not two teachers study alike, not two can. Some lack aids, and they may be dull at the time of study. Their study may yield paltry results. Others may have too many aids, and their imagination may be lively. These may not complete the task before them, because of the abundance of material which they must collect and digest. And a real study of a lesson in Bible History, according to our authority, is a complex effort. There is memorizing to do. There must be a proper disposition of the material to be treated. Uncommon and difficult terms must be explained in a few striking words.* A map may have to be used; data from natural history or from chronology may have to be furnished; an available illustration may have to be explained. Last, not least, the objective of the story, the "pointe," must be fixed.

The book before us meets these wants, every one of them. It is the most practical, most efficient, and most delightful aid to a

teacher at his preparation for the Bible History lesson of which we have knowledge. If at any time in the history of our parochial schools the teacher's study in this department was made pleasant, well-directed, and fruitful, it is now. We have only words of praise and commendation for this book.

The author's plan may be briefly sketched as follows: After some pertinent introductory remarks, he takes up the text of the story as it is offered in the text-book of the children. Every important term receives a brief illuminating gloss. Occasionally the equivalent term from the English Bible is given. At the end, references to cognate matter in the Catechism and hymn-book are given, and a list of collateral Bible readings is appended. A memorial verse, or stanza, concludes the whole. Critical points of doctrine are frequently explained in an excursus in small type after the treatise proper. The entire book is intended exclusively for the teacher.

Bible History has been correctly termed "the foundation of the entire instruction in religion, yea, of all true piety." Director Lindemann presented the importance of this study in his *Schulpraxis* (p. 22 f.) in these words: "The faith of Christianity rests on the divine revelation, on historical facts, without the knowledge of which no person can lay claim to the Christian religion and to a healthy life of faith. Stories, such as that of the creation of the world, and of the human race, of the fall, of the promise of salvation, of the gathering and guidance of the Church of God in the time of the Old Testament, of the manifestation of the Messiah, and the complete redemption of the entire world, finally, of the preaching of the Gospel among all nations—briefly, the history which the Holy Spirit has narrated in the Bible, everybody must necessarily know who wishes to be called a true Lutheran. It is this history, too, which, more than any other, produces true culture; for it is not only true in every respect, but it is told in a manner to make it truly beneficial. Except a person has learned from Bible History to understand the way in which God works, he can have no correct judgment of the modern history of the world and the Church. (Accordingly, a God-fearing peasant not infrequently has a better judgment of historical events than a learned professor who lacks the Biblical foundation.)

"Children understand the Bible stories with greater ease and better results than the abstract teaching of the Catechism. For this reason, the first and best religious training that can be offered them is, to tell them Bible stories. In the various characters and nations that occur in these stories, the children learn to understand most clearly, on the one hand, the great corruption of the entire nature

of man, on the other, the mercy of God and the operations of His grace. In studying others, they learn to know their own heart,—they learn to regard unbelief as the perdition, faith as the only salvation of every person. They learn that men, left to their own devices, rush headlong into one misfortune after the other, and have no peace, except when they suffer the Gospel to heal them. They learn to regard earth as a vale of sorrows on account of sin. They learn that all the saints have found comfort in their heavenly citizenship, of which, in accordance with the divine promise, they became partakers by faith.—Such knowledge is truly enlivening and saving knowledge."

We congratulate all who must teach Bible History to children upon the publication of Teacher Simon's book.

5. **THE SCOFIELD REFERENCE BIBLE.** Authorized Version, with a New System of Connected Topical References to all the greater themes of Scripture, with annotations, revised marginal renderings, summaries, definitions, and index. To which are added helps at hard places, explanations of seeming discrepancies, and a new system of paragraphs. Edited by *Rev. C. I. Scofield*, D. D. Oxford University Press. 1362 pages, and an indexed atlas of the Bible; \$4.00.

The character of this Bible is indicated by the exhaustive title, which adequately describes the various efforts made in this book to lead the student of the Bible to a correct and full understanding of its meaning in particular places, of its plan and scope in a given book, of its harmonious teaching throughout, and to facilitate a comprehensive grasp of its teaching. Dr. Scofield has had the co-operation of men of national reputation in the preparation of this Bible, *viz.*, Dr. Weston of the Crozier Seminary, Dr. Gray of the Moody Bible Institute, Dr. Erdmann of Princeton Seminary, Dr. Moorehead of Xenia U. P. Theological Seminary, Dr. Harris of the Toronto Bible Institute, Dr. Arthur T. Pierson, and Arno C. Gaebelein. Besides these, European scholars, like Prof. Barrellet, of the Theological Faculty of Lausanne, Professors Sayce and Margoliouth of Oxford, and Mr. Walter Scott, have aided the work by "suggestions of inestimable value."

The feature from which this Bible derives its name, are the subject references, found in the center of the page. Any important Biblical concept is noted at the place where it occurs for the first time; the next place where it occurs again is indicated, and the

first and last places in the entire Bible where the concept is found are given in brackets at each link of the chain. Take, *e. g.*, the concept "inspiration;" the system of references directs us first to Exod. 4, 15, thence to vv. 28 and 30, thence to ch. 17, 14, to 19, 6. 7, to 20, 1, to 24, 3. 4. 7. 8. 12, to 32, 16, to 34, 1. 27. 28, to 35, 1; to Num. 11, 24, to 22, 38, to 23, 5. 12—16; to Deut. 4, 2. 13, and along a line running through the following passages: Deut. 5, 22; 10, 1—4; 29, 29; 31, 24; 2 Sam. 23, 2; Job 6, 10; 32, 18; Ps. 68, 11; Is. 6, 5—9; 8, 1; 30, 8; 59, 21; Jer. 1, 9; 30, 2; 36, 1—32; 45, 1. 2; Ezek. 2, 2; Amos 3, 7; Micah 3, 8; Hab. 2, 2; Zech. 7, 7; Matt. 4, 4. 7. 10; 5, 18; 10, 14; 11, 13; 12, 3—5. 40; 19, 4—8; 22, 31. 32; 24, 15. 37—39; 26, 54; 28, 19. 20; Mark 1, 44; 7, 8—13; 10, 4—9. 19; 12, 26. 36; Luke 1, 3; 4, 17—21. 27; 10, 16; 11, 49—51; 16, 29—31; 17, 27. 29. 32; 20, 37; 24, 25—27. 44. 45; John 3, 14; 5, 46. 47; 6, 31. 32. 45. 49. 63; 7, 21—23; 8, 40. 47. 56; 12, 48; 13, 18; 14, 10; 15, 27; 16, 12. 13; 17, 8. 17. 20; Acts 1, 8. 16; 9, 15; 28, 25; Rom. 16, 25. 26; 1 Cor. 2, 7. 16; 14, 37; Gal. 1, 11. 12; Eph. 3, 3. 5; 6, 17; 1 Tim. 4, 1; 2 Tim. 3, 16; 1 Pet. 1, 10—12. 25; 2 Pet. 1, 21; Rev. 1, 1. 19; 2, 1. 8. 12. 18; 3, 1. 7. 14; 14, 13; 19, 9; 21, 5; 22, 18. 19. We have selected one of the most exhaustive chains of references, in order to enable any one who will take the trouble to test both the strong and the weak points of the chain. Not every link in the chain is of equal value; some might have been omitted, others inserted, *e. g.*, Ps. 45, 1. The chain can be picked up at any point along the line, and can be traced forward, but not backward.—The text of the Bible has been divided into paragraphs by italicized sub-heads; however, the chapter and verse divisions of the Authorized Version have been preserved. Here, too, opinions will be found expressed from which one must dissent. *E. g.*, the sequence of events in Gen. 1, 1—3 is represented thus: v. 1 recounts the original creation; this is destroyed by some unknown catastrophe, the results of which are stated in v. 2, and Jer. 4, 23—26 is cited to justify this idea; v. 3 recounts "the new beginning."—Trichotomy is taught in the note to Gen. 1, 27.—Among the definitions we note that of justification in a note on Rom. 3, 28: "J. may be defined as the judicial act of God whereby He justly declares righteous one who believes on Jesus Christ. It is the Judge Himself who thus declares. The justified believer has been in court, and has been cleared."—Each book of the Bible is provided with an introduction.—Marginal notes briefly explaining points in Biblical archaeology, chronology, are given *in loco*.—The expository notes are really helpful, and, upon the whole, this Bible is the soberest of the annotated Bibles that have been published in our generation.